CHILD STUDY

A JOURNAL OF PARENT EDUCATION

NOVEMBER, 1936

CONTENTS

The Editor's Page - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 34
Justice Justine Wise Tulin

Women in the Modern World - - - - - - - - - - - 35
Dorothy Thompson

Woman's Subjective Dependence Upon Man - - - - - - 39
Beatrice M. Hinkle, M.D.

Scientific Contributions to an Age-Old Controversy - - - 42
Helen Sternau

Woman's Stake in a Changing Social Order - - - - - - - 45
Harry L. Lurie

Parents' Questions and Discussion - - - - - - - - - - 49

Study Outline - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 51

Readers' Slants - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 52

Science Contributes—Convalescent Serums in Measles and Scarlet Fever - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 54

Shop Talk - 56

News and Notes - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 57

In the Magazines - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 59

FIFTEEN CENTS A COPY VOL. XIV, NO. 2 ONE DOLLAR THE YEAR

EDITORIAL BOARD
SIDONIE MATSNER GRUENBERG
CÉCILE PILPEL
ANNA W. M. WOLF
JOSETTE FRANK

EDITORIAL ASSOCIATES
ZILPHA CARRUTHERS FRANKLIN
PAULINE RUSH FADIMAN
BESS B. LANE

CHILD STUDY entered as second class matter March 8, 1926, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Copyright 1934 by Child Study Association of America, Inc. Published by Select Printing Company, Inc., 80 Lafayette Street, New York, N. Y. Eight months, October through May. Fifteen cents per copy, one dollar a year. Add twenty-five cents for all foreign subscriptions

★

HEADLINES

The four women who write for CHILD STUDY this month are all mothers, and all hold outside jobs, too. Which would qualify them to have a personal understanding of women's problems.

★

Dorothy Thompson is one of the most famous women journalists in the country, and is attracting wide attention now with her column in the *Herald Tribune*. Dr. Beatrice Hinkle is a leading psychiatrist and the first woman physician ever to hold a public health position. Dr. Hinkle and Miss Thompson gave the first two lectures in this year's symposium on "Marriage Today." Justine Wise Tulin is a Justice of the Court of Domestic Relations. Helen Sternau does special part-time work for the Child Study Association, and believes that part-time work solves her problem of how to budget time between a home and a job. Dr. Harry L. Lurie is executive director of the National Council of Jewish Federation and Welfare Funds; and Dr. William Thalhimer is director of the Manhattan Convalescent Serum Laboratory.

★

Authorities, all. But in our new department, *Readers' Slants*, we bring you the authority of the readers themselves. Here we will print expressions of widely differing attitudes on all subjects, even though they may be irrelevant to the special topic of the issue. In this new department we hope to offer the individual slants of our readers.

D. D. H.

THE EDITORS' PAGE

THE title "Women in Conflict" at once evokes the picture of those conflicts common to all women who assume the responsibilities for both a home and a job in the outside world. The largest group of these women is composed of those who are forced to work in order to secure the minimum necessities of life for themselves and their dependents. A large proportion of these women having worked from childhood until marriage are forced to return to work between child-bearing periods or within a few years after their children have been born. The physical stress of constant labor at home and at work is heightened by the strain due to poverty, economic insecurity, and the awareness that their children are suffering from physical neglect and the lack of adequate direction. The consequence of fatigue and anxiety experienced by these women must affect every relationship in their homes.

THE second group consists of those women who work to maintain standards of comfort. In this group which includes many white collar as well as industrial workers, the child-bearing period is frequently postponed and the family is limited to one or two children, cared for by a grandmother or other parent substitute. The stress of this situation is threefold: the mother has an awareness of the inadequate supervision of the child; the father's awareness is aggravated by the traditional ideology which assumes that a mother should care for her own child; the child deprived of his mother and given an untrained person, and sensing in addition the conflict in the parents, frequently suffers from a sense of emotional insecurity.

THIRD, there is the increasing number of women to whom work, though not the result of economic pressure, is pursued nevertheless as a necessary and healthy expression of their own needs as human beings, and to whom it is as essential a part of life as to the average man. In this group the absence of economic necessity gives full play to the traditional prejudice of our society which looks askance at the woman who works though adequately supported by her husband.

THREE important problems must be understood and faced if the conflicts for women who work are to be resolved. Economic security must be assured to women so that they will not be forced to leave their homes in order to secure the economic necessities at a time when they are physically and emotionally unfit for work. A broad social program for the care of children by a trained personnel must be provided for all children in the community beginning with preschool days, so that the children may have an adequate program of work and play, and so that the mothers may have the emotional security necessary to taking their part in the outside world. Finally, there must be a continuous process of reeducation through which the traditional taboos limiting the development and usefulness of women in the outside world as well as in the home shall be recognized as archaic and therefore be discarded.

Justine Wise Tulin

Women in the Modern World

By DOROTHY THOMPSON

AFTER nearly twenty years of women's political emancipation in the United States I was asked to debate on the radio, a few months ago, the question: Is Woman's Place in the Home? There are eleven million women wage earners in the United States. Women own approximately one-half of the nation's wealth and probably control 90 per cent of our spending power. Women are physicians, lawyers, engineers, business executives, presidents of corporations, and of colleges, members of governing bodies, and a woman, for the first time in American history, sits in the President's cabinet. There is hardly an activity closed to women, or not yet entered by them. One would have thought the question was settled. But it is not settled. The issue is a live one, and even more live now than it was five years ago. Believe it or not, like it or not, you can't laugh off the fact that there is a growing resentment in the whole Western world against the role played by women in this moment of this century. In the last fifty years a revolution has taken place, a revolution which is probably as disturbing to the social order as any other revolution, as the relation, for instance, between employers and employes. It is the revolution in the relations between men and women. Now, revolutions usually have their counter-revolutions, and there is gathering in the world a counter-revolution against women's freedom. Five, or even ten years ago, it was hard to find an intelligent person who would publicly take an anti-feminist attitude. Today a great many intelligent people are taking it. *And a great many of these people are young.* It isn't the old fogies today who are clamoring to restore women to the kitchen stove and the nursery. It is the young men going out into the world and finding that there isn't work for them. Italian Fascism, and German National Socialism, which established dictatorships in two great European countries, both promptly and firmly suppressed women. *And they were both youth movements.*

These new young anti-feminists summon a whole lot of reasonable arguments to support their thesis. There is, for instance, Mr. Lawrence Dennis, our leading young American Fascist. He may be—and in my estimation is—terribly wrong, but he is not stupid. He thinks he knows the way the world is going, and he thinks he knows the way the United States is going. He has outlined a program for America and he devotes a whole chapter of his book "The Coming American Fascism" to telling us how the future commonwealth is going to treat women.

> "Problems involving women should . . . be thought of only as a great series of exercises in *making* women play their rôles suitably in the given social scheme."
>
> "Marriage, of course, is, and remains women's chief career." . . . "The employed woman usually has an exacting boss, whereas the married woman is usually the boss of the man." "Today in the United States the number of women gainfully employed is about equal to the number of unemployed men. . . . In the adjustments about to be made . . . a large but gradual transfer of women from office and factory to the home . . . is clearly indicated." "Most women get the job simply because their labor is cheaper."
>
> "Personal tastes are the result of social conditioning. Social conditioning is a process which the state must control in the public interest." (Women, he is arguing, must be "conditioned" to marriage and child bearing.)

I quote at length from Mr. Dennis, because he is an exceptionally articulate exponent of a point of view which is exactly that of Mussolini and Hitler and which is by no means confined to those Americans who call themselves fascists. It is very widely held; it buttresses itself with reason, and it is accompanied by an extraordinary intensity of feeling.

After my very good-natured debate on the air with Sir Gerald Campbell, I had some amazing experiences. I happened to be traveling at the time, doing some speaking, and wherever I was recognized, in trains, in hotels, men who were total strangers opened conversations with me on the subject. They wanted to go on with the debate. And I was astonished at the hostility to women, and to the role played by women, which revealed itself beneath the most courteous and tentative phrases. I began to think that James Thurber's funny drawings in *The New Yorker,* depicting the terrifying woman and the meek little man really represent an almost universal viewpoint.

Let me tell you what men in the United States

say about women:—They say that women run this country and that men haven't got a chance; they say that women no longer care about having husbands and babies and that it isn't worth while any more to work for women because men aren't appreciated; they say that women are taking away men's jobs; they say that whereas most men want to work for some woman, most women work for themselves; they say that women prefer to have their own incomes, their own apartments, and take "love" where they may rather than being dependent on one man and sticking to him; they blame women for flaming youth; they blame women for the crime wave; they blame women for the collapse of private and public morals and private and public manners; they say that women want to have their cake and eat it, to be protected and free, to be provided for and independent; they say that they are lonely.

And now, let me tell you what women say:—They say that it is harder and harder for a woman to get a job in competition with men, even if she is equally or better equipped; they say that men resent women intensely in all executive positions; they say that men are increasingly unwilling to accept the sole financial responsibility for a wife and family; they say that no woman can count nowadays on her husband—as likely as not he will run off with an eighteen-year-old cutie and leave her stranded and alone in middle age; they say that their husbands do not share their business cares with them and make fun of their own "cultural" activities; they blame men for flaming youth; they blame men for the crime wave; they blame men for the collapse of private and public morals and private and public manners; they say men don't know how to make love and don't understand women; they say that they are lonely.

It looks as though we only had to hear from the youngsters to come to the conclusion that the world, as someone has already said, is divided into three fundamentally hostile groups—men, women, and children.

And this, in what has been called The Woman's Century.

* * * * *

How far have women come in fifty years?

Fifty years ago the very physical activities of women were proscribed by a mode of dress which today seems barbarous. Nowhere has woman made more radical gains over the Victorian period than in the field of sports. No woman statesman today is so unthinkable in terms of the 1880's as is Helen Wills Moody or Amelia Earhart.

Fifty years ago only a few of the women's colleges existing today had been founded, and the state universities which were opening their doors to women were still in the experimental stage. Women were already in industry, and the typewriter and the sewing machines had taken hundreds of thousands of them out of their homes, but the more dignified, honored, and remunerative professions were still practically closed to them. As late as 1893 the famous Dr. Osler wrote that human beings could be divided into three groups: men, women, and women physicians. There were less than a hundred women lawyers in the whole United States, fifty years ago.

Legally, and in most states, fifty years ago women were not "people." "Husband and wife were one person and that person was the husband." No "nice" woman would go to a hotel alone, and no good hotel would accommodate an unaccompanied woman.

For no group of human beings on earth has the world so opened up since the end of the nineteenth century as for women. Between 1920 and 1930 there was an increase of 26 per cent of women in industry, and in the same time an increase of more than half a million women in the learned professions. Today there is no profession—including mining engineering—in which they are not represented.

But far and away the greatest and most significant change which has occurred has been in the field of morals. Birth control has changed woman's life far more than ballots.

Could we go back even if we wanted to? "Marriage," says Mr. Dennis, "is, and remains, woman's chief career." If by "chief career" Mr. Dennis means that marriage is usually the central and most important thing in a woman's life, then he is certainly correct. But is it, and is it likely to remain, or become again the sole or even the chief center of her actual activities? I doubt it.

Except for the very rich, most of the healthy human being's waking time is spent in work. And it is well that it is so. For it is by work, the application of one's muscles or brains, to materials or problems, that mankind creates, not only the world in which he lives but himself as well. Women have always done their share of the work of the world and never at any time has marriage been *in and of itself* a career divorced from work. Even in pioneer days, when birth control was unknown and child-bearing unrestricted, women in this country worked shoulder to shoulder with men, clearing forests and building

homes. They were, in primitive fashion, manufacturers, for they canned and preserved the foods of the summer against the famine of the winter, and spun and wove the linens and the woolens which were the clothing of the household. They contributed directly and fundamentally to the support of the home.

No one, not the most zealous fascist, is going to propose that the industrial activities once centered in the home should be returned to it. And no one is going to persuade women to return to uncontrolled and unlimited child-bearing, however much he may propose it. Mussolini has tried it, and it is his most dismal failure. The birth rate in Italy is declining, and it began to decline when Mussolini issued his first vigorous manifesto against birth control. It almost looks as though he had put an idea into the heads of a lot of simple peasant women who had never heard of such a thing before.

The Catholic Church which continues to oppose the mechanical limitation of families has recognized and approved "natural" control.

The woman in the modern, small, mechanically equipped household, with a limited family, is not going to return to canning corn and tomatoes when she can buy far better products cheaper than the individual kitchen can produce them. She is not going to make her children's clothes, when factory production can turn out a better, and prettier product at the same cost. She is not going to take her children back into the nursery to be educated at the fireside, because she believes that the trained child specialists can do it better.

To shut women out of everything except home activities today would mean to confine them to a more limited existence than they have ever had in history. It would mean the sterilization of the creative talents of one-half of the people.

The second question which arises in one's mind in connection with the query: Can they go back? is what such a reactionary tendency would do to the business world itself. The analogy between the number of women working and the number of men unemployed seems to suggest that if women stopped working men would have jobs. Of course, nothing of the kind would necessarily follow. Sending a woman lingerie salesman home would not do anything for an unemployed coal miner. By and large, and on the whole, women are still doing what has traditionally been described as "woman's work," only they are doing it under the conditions imposed by a modern industrial society. Of the occupations engaging the eleven million women wage earners the largest in this country is still domestic service, which in 1930—the last year for which figures are available—gave jobs to a million and a half women or over 13 per cent of all women employed. It is interesting to record that in those countries—Germany and Italy—which are making an effort to force women back into the home, a vastly increased number of women have been drafted into domestic service, with a consequent lowering of the wage standards of this work, which everywhere is one of the worst paid and most arbitrarily administered of women's occupations.

The second occupation, numerically, for women, is school teaching, in which nearly a million women are employed. It can very well be argued that there are too many women teaching school, or better still, too few men, but no one can say that teaching children their A B C's has not been a traditional occupation for women. There are more women office workers than there are women factory workers, and here again, women are in offices because men want them there. It is a field of work where the qualities traditionally attributed to women make them most useful: neatness, patience with detail, orderliness, and willingness to identify their interests with those of someone else.

In actual factory work, again, woman predominates in those industries where she was *always* a manufacturer. Women outnumber men in only twelve industries: clothing, with its various subdivisions, silk and knitting, cigar and cigarette making, and candy manufacture. Who shall say that in this they are taking men's work away from them? On the contrary, men have invaded all the more lucrative of women's traditional occupations. There are more men milliners, and more men home decorators in America than there are women. Almost all the really well-paying positions as cooks are held by men, and it could be reasonably argued that the only traditional female activity exclusively reserved for women is bearing children. And probably if a means could be devised to make child-bearing painless and profitable, men would have done their best to get into that, too.

In certain occupations, women are indubitably better qualified than men. Women are unquestionably better sopranos, actresses, manicurists, and sellers of household goods and women's garments than men. They have done brilliantly in advertising, especially of wares designed to appeal to women

buyers. And it is impossible to imagine the telephone system without women.

Women are in industry because, either their traditional activities have been industrialized, or because new activities have been created for which they are especially fitted. And, they are unquestionably in industry because their existences depend upon it. There is not a doubt in the world that a sizeable increase in men's wages enabling them to support their families without double earnings would, if it were accompanied also by a decrease in prices, result in many women leaving industry and going in exclusively for home life. The woman who has to leave small children to do unpleasant work, earning insufficient money to pay for competent care for her household, does so against her will. That thousands of women *must* work is proved by the mere fact that the average wage for women in the whole United States is $11 a week. Nobody is working eight hours a day for $11 a week for fun.

* * * * *

The resentment against women in certain fields of activity may be due to psychological factors difficult to gauge, it may be due to envy, and it may be partially justifiable. Stanley Walker, in his book "City Editor" in which he describes the newspaper world of the last decade, pays flattering respects to a few individual newspaperwomen, but insists that on the whole they are inferior to men, that they depend on their male colleagues to help them over tough places, sulk at reproof, disdain well-meant advice, and "do not understand" honor, fair play, and the code of human and professional conduct as men understand them. If women want to keep the gains they have made, and progress farther, very little can be won by disregarding criticisms of this kind. After years of "living in a man's world," I am convinced that it is perfectly true that women are not yet nearly good enough, not nearly grown up to the opportunities available to them. *They do not yet begin to make sufficient demands upon themselves.* It is true that many women "want to have their cake and eat it, too." Of course, every woman worth the name wants to be treated as a woman. But she needs to revise what being "treated like a woman" means. She has got to give up Victorian ideas of chivalry in the modern world. Victorian ideals were based on the theory that woman is weak and defenseless, although there is no evidence in the whole animal kingdom to justify any such theory. She did not expect men to do her work when her place was in the home, and she ought not to expect men to compensate for her inefficiencies in the outside world. She is still far from being as disinterested as men, she is more incapable of impersonal evaluations; she is more easily wounded in her vanity. But all this is changing. On the other hand, she must strive to avoid swallowing without criticism all the values of the world of men. Aggressiveness is contrary to her essential nature; her great role in nature as in society is her drawing power, her capacity to draw people to herself and draw people together. If she abandons or weakens this power in favor of unbridled competition for prestige, she is weakening herself in her own stronghold.

* * * * *

The social effects of the emancipation of women are the ones engaging the greatest attention in the world. To what extent has there been a collapse of public and private morals and to what extent, if at all, has the emancipation of women contributed to this? Is it true that the home is breaking up? Ideas of morality are undergoing changes. Back of conceptions of morality are usually considerations of what is good for the race under any given set of social conditions. A pioneer or a militaristic society wants vast quantities of children, the one to furnish workers to open up unexploited land, the other to furnish cannon fodder. They invariably subject women to that end. The social aims of any society determine its morality.

In a hundred ways it is clearly demonstrable that the moral qualities of the modern woman are as far superior to the moral qualities of her Victorian ancestor as the morality of a free man is superior to that of a slave. The first test of a high degree of morality is willingness to accept responsibility for the personal and social results of one's behavior. If the modern woman is less willing than her grandmother to leave the fate of her children to God or to destiny, is that not an advance in moral responsibility? If the modern woman feels an increased responsibility to make the very most of her talents and energies, is that not a moral advance? Is the rate of divorce among women who work at business or professions higher or lower than amongst those women who are completely supported? It is, of course, highest amongst rich, and *idle* women. Nothing has so imposed increased disciplines upon women as having to subject themselves to the control of the business and professional world. And it is precisely because they are still relatively unused to these disciplines that Mr. Walker

(*Continued on page 60*)

Woman's Subjective Dependence Upon Man*

By BEATRICE M. HINKLE, M.D.

IT IS written in the Good Book that in the beginning it was Eve who dared to eat of the fruit of the tree of knowledge—and it was Adam who timidly followed her lead. Certainly no sign of female weakness or dependence is manifest in this first recorded act of the first human couple. But it was through this very deed of daring and aggression that Eve inadvertently brought about her own subjugation; inasmuch as the Lord in His wrath declared, "I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception; in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children; and thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee."

Whether this Bible story possesses any objective significance or not, the incontrovertible fact is that woman has been relentlessly bound by nature to the wheel of her biological destiny. She was doomed to bring forth children and then more children, and to labor and care for them as do the beasts of the field, while man was left free from this burden to pursue his individual destiny. True, he had to earn his bread by the sweat of his brow, which curse, however, was equally shared by woman. It is not astonishing, therefore, that for untold centuries woman should have remained unconscious of herself as a being separate from the man and the child, and that, as a consequence, her mind as well as her body should have been dominated by the man and the child.

The astonishing matter to those who think that the removal of external hindrances and restricting laws solves all problems is that having succeeded in throwing off the yoke of physical subjugation to man—as she has done here in America—woman should still cling tenaciously, although largely unconsciously, to her psychic dependence upon him.

There is no disputing the fact that the women of America have gained their freedom—outwardly. They are recognized as necessary factors in the economic and industrial life of the nation, and by their own efforts they have attained practically all of the opportunities and advantages in the way of education, legal status, and political rights that men possess. Yet they are dominated largely by masculine methods and attitudes, and as far as the world outside the home, as well as the world of opinion, is concerned, they are almost wholly identified with masculine psychology.

Woman's Bugaboo—
The Feeling of Inferiority

• Among the most intelligent women, the unthinking acceptance of the masculine point of view even about themselves, their own feelings, and what is desirable or normal for them, their needs and life direction, would be laughable were it not tragic—tragic because of their real desire and great need to possess an individual attitude of their own. One of the most frequent experiences in my consulting room is to hear intelligent, college-bred women with good minds, but suffering from various neurotic ailments, restless and miserable, preface their discussion of their condition by what "my husband (or my father) thinks is the cause of my trouble." "My husband thinks I am too ambitious," or "I am not strong," or "I try to do too much," and so on.

In the circle of my own acquaintance I have been amazed to hear women, whose professional accomplishment ranked much higher than that of the average man working along similar lines, confess sadly that they felt inferior to men, and that no matter what they accomplished they could not throw off this feeling. The only reason that they could give for their sense of inferiority was one based on physical considerations solely—the menstrual function with its attendant disabilities, and their lack of general physical strength as compared with men.

Indeed, this cultural conditioning of the female sex to inferiority has entered so deeply into the souls of women that they can free themselves of it only by a conscious effort. If those who consider themselves emancipated continue in the way they are going—of making as complete an identification of themselves with men as is possible, instead of happily recognizing themselves as women, and searching for their own values—they will not only fail to raise themselves from their feelings of inferiority but they will achieve nothing more for the world than a duplication of many of man's shortsighted policies. The crying need of the world today is for a new direction of life, a new set of values to replace those which now domi-

* Extracted from an article by Dr. Hinkle in *Harpers* magazine for January, 1932, with the kind permission of the publishers and author.

nate men; not for a horde of women to repeat and continue the masculine attitudes and symbols of value, ignoring the fact that they might be able as women to help create a new world point of view.

As a matter of fact, woman is richly endowed by nature in more than a few respects. In the physical realm she possesses the capacity for endurance and adaptation to an amazing degree; she is resourceful, rising to emergencies and conquering difficulties that require courage and keen intelligence; she is the producer of the race and is the original source upon which all men are primarily dependent. Maternal love, as contrasted with narcissistic love, is the basis of love for others and of altruism; in fact, all that men know of love has been awakened in them by women. Woman was the originator of all the primitive arts—as Lester Ward and other authorities have emphasized—and she is well endowed with the important functions of feeling and intuition.

Woman's sense of inferiority as woman, then, cannot come from her lack of natural endowments. It comes rather from the cultural conditioning and aggressive domination of men through the long ages. It is a collective, environmental product rather than an inner personal condition and, as such, will gradually disappear as a different environmental attitude arises.

Which Sex Is "Dominant"?

• Up to the present era women as a class have had no chance to achieve the development of a self, for the reason that they have been denied education and the discipline deriving from the activities reserved for men. Instead, woman's ego has been identified with the love object and the child—nature having taken this means of assuring the preservation of the race. From primitive times women not only had to bear children incessantly but to care and provide for them by the hardest kind of toil. In most tribal groups they also had to till the soil and labor as hard as any of the men; for it was believed that the female, being a fertile creature herself, could transmit that fertility to the seeds and earth.

With the ascendancy and development of the industrial era, when children became no longer an economic asset but a liability, woman's child-bearing function has become relatively less important, and marriage has assumed an entirely different status. One frequently hears the statement made that in America woman is now the dominant sex. It must be admitted that she dominates the home and has almost complete direction of the children; for the average husband, unfortunately, is so taken up with his business that he has little time to give to family affairs. For the same reason, she also dominates the cultural life not only of the family but of the whole country. Indeed, there is no doubt but that American women are outwardly, as far as family and esthetic affairs are concerned, in the ascendancy over American men. As a consequence of this freedom of action concerning their own affairs they are blinded to their real status, and unconsciously deceive others. We are all so accustomed to think in terms of the external conditions of life, its sensory and purely objective aspects, that we forget that life evolves and develops from within outward, instead of the other way around, and that the mere freedom to carry out one's desires and one's will rarely leads to happiness. That is why so many American women find themselves discontented and unhappy in spite of their outward freedom and independence.

What Price Freedom?

• The most frequent complaint that I hear from women is, "I have nothing to wish for, all the freedom I want, ample means, and yet here I am, sick and miserable, restless and dissatisfied. What is the matter with me?" It is the failure of the external freedom to bring the expected satisfaction to women that causes many persons of both sexes whose insight does not penetrate very far to conclude that all the new opportunity and striving on the part of women are futile, and what they need is to go back to their former status where the strong arm and will of man determined their behavior and actions. They forget that all going back is regression, and that the denial of self-responsibility by normal human beings is not the answer to any problem. It means loss, a surrender of effort, defeat. Indeed, this is not the cure for the restlessness and dissatisfaction of women today. The cure is more struggle and effort until they find that needed security and sense of value within themselves.

Unquestionably the women of America are in the throes of a profound change. The industrial expansion of the age has forced many women to leave their homes and to take up the economic responsibility of their own lives. It has given all women the opportunity to earn their own living and to be economically independent of men. It has produced the outer conditions which make possible the development of the inner attitude so necessary for the achievement of a selfhood. It has brought about a new relation among women toward one another. This new attitude of

acceptance and regard for one another is a matter of tremendous significance, for it means, psychologically, the acceptance by woman of herself, and is the prelude to the overcoming of her great psychic dependence upon man. This is one of the reasons why it is so disturbing to the male portion of humanity, for it heralds the psychological development of a new personality for woman, the attainment of a true individuality, in which she may gain a relation to man instead of a dependence upon him.

Man's Neglect of Woman's Needs

• Women of the Western world would not now be experiencing any such intense inner struggle as exists today if the men of their world had not become such egoists as to neglect so completely women's instinctive needs. Even while they contend that women are predominantly sexual beings who can find fulfilment only in love and child-bearing, they have given honor to a code which demanded that women must never give expression to this great need or betray by their actions their natural desires.

Only compare this attitude with that of the Hindus or the Brahmans, who likewise believe that woman can have no worthy existence except through conjunction with man. The Brahmic code makes it the goal and duty of man to consider the woman's sexual desires as paramount to his own, while the general custom of the Western man has been to satisfy his own desires and give very little thought, first or last, to those of the woman. Nor does he give himself psychically—or imaginatively—to the service of love; instead he devotes his energies almost entirely to the pursuit of worldly gain and his own egotistic interests. This is particularly true of the Anglo-Saxon man, who has almost totally disregarded the love needs of women.

Therefore, following a psychological law, the Anglo-Saxon women, rather than be destroyed by the suppression of their instinctive needs, were forced to seek new outlets for their libido, or psychic energy, where they would not be completely dependent upon man's favor and attention; and as a result they are the most advanced and alert of any women in the world.

This forced diversion of the libido from its instinctive channel in women whose natural purpose is that of race bearer and conservator, has unquestionably produced a definite effect upon their psychology. It has forced them to seek for ego satisfaction in other avenues than that bound up with the favor of man and so far opens the way to greater individual development. It must be remembered that it was a similar sexual conflict that forced man through the ages to develop his individualistic tendencies and more objective attitudes, although in his case the push arose from within, while for woman it has been forced upon her from without.

Need for Inner Independence

• The greatest need for woman is to attain self-realization, consciousness of herself as a distinct personality apart from her biological function, and thus gain an inner freedom. Only when this is attained can a true relationship develop between man and woman wherein sex antagonism, envy, and rivalry cease to exist. Only then can modern woman give herself freely in love, and both man and woman gain the completion that comes from such giving.

Women who wish to attain a true inner independence must first of all cease to judge themselves according to men's opinion of their sex. They must be penetrating enough to see that the average man's attitude barely conceals a fear and a wish—a fear that woman will become his rival in the sphere he has made his own while he cannot invade her realm, and a wish to hold her in the bonds of her instinctive functioning.

Further, women should cease rationalizing their sense of inferiority and blaming it on their physical weakness. There are actually women among many ethnic groups who are physically the equal of men. However, instead of worshiping the physical strength of man, let them develop a strength of a different order, that is to say, moral strength, which still commands the greatest respect from the world. Indeed, if this comparative lack of physical strength is a reality to which women must adapt themselves, then they actually possess the fundamental condition of all progress, namely, the pressure of a necessity, without which little human development would occur.

Let women, too, make the most of their important function of feeling rather than regret its dominance, for, disciplined, it is quite as valuable a function for life as is thought. In life, situations often arise in which a feeling judgment is the only adequate one, while thought flounders about entirely at a loss in the matter. The mistake is frequently made of confusing the function of feeling with emotional reactions, and calling a display of undisciplined or childish emotion a result of too great feeling. This is not feeling but the expression of an immature and undeveloped personality. It is certainly true that a person

(*Continued on page 61*)

Scientific Contributions to an Age-Old Controversy

By HELEN STERNAU

ARE there constitutional differences in the psychology of men and women? In other words, do men as a group differ from women as a group, in character, temperament, aims, and capacities; do sex differences outweigh individual differences; and is there any reason to believe that they are inherently rooted in biological function or structure? Tradition, at least in our familiar culture, answers categorically, "Yes." The extreme feminists reply with an equally emphatic "No," and the disinterested scientist—when he has concerned himself with this question at all—finds it an extremely difficult one to answer.

Tradition suggests that men are more aggressive, adventuresome, and daring—women more passive, conservative, and practical; that men are interested primarily in things and their mechanisms—women in people and their behavior; that women are more swayed by feeling, men by logic; and that women are more preoccupied with love goals, men with power goals. Perhaps less generally accepted, but still current, are further conceptions about women's inferior intellectual equipment, especially as regards ability for abstract thought, and their greater concern with moral and spiritual values.

Ardent feminists, however, contend that much of this tradition is pure fiction, consciously or unconsciously fostered to uphold masculine sexual and economic dominance; that few of the claimed differences are measurable; and that those which can be demonstrated are not necessarily inborn but probably the result of social pressure. The social environment of men and women is not and never has been the same, they point out. This is, in itself, sufficient to account for observable differences.

Dangerous Assumptions

• The feminists may be right, suggests the impartial observer, but we have no proof. Our customary assumptions are not entirely objective. Many of them are demonstrably false, but the tradition may contain some truth none the less. It is true that many of the alleged differences between men and women are immeasurable, but that neither proves nor disproves their existence. Certainly, social environment has been an important factor in the production of known differences; this cannot be too strongly stressed. But we have no proof that it is the only factor. For although it is certainly fallacious to assume that sex differences are biologically linked when social factors might have produced them, it is no more logical to claim that they are entirely socially conditioned without considering the biological factor. And we are just beginning to understand the enormous complications of biological sexuality, its inter-relation with the entire endocrine balance of the body—and therefore with temperament and personality.

With physical and social factors both so difficult to decipher and control, conclusive experimentation has been almost impossible. It is not surprising, then, that practically every fact brought forward seems to be open to more than one interpretation, and each new study of sex differences is greeted with a barrage of debate. Much of the literature sounds far from objective. For after all, investigators are men and women and many of them are deeply involved emotionally in the very problems which they are trying to investigate.

Objective observers, reviewing available material from various sources, in general agree that the question is, for the time being, unanswerable. None the less, our present knowledge destroys some earlier fallacies and opens up interesting avenues of speculation.

Physical Sex Differences

• First, how much do we know of the physical basis of sex?

It seems clear that the development of two distinct sexes is a relatively late step in evolution, and that the separate male and female forms which now exist have been evolved by adaptation from the same undifferentiated basis. The male and female genitals are elaborate variations of the same basic structure. Rudiments of undeveloped male organs are still present in the female and vice versa, with a surprising degree of individual variation.

Sex is determined at the time of conception by

specific factors of the sperm cell which fertilizes the egg, male and female bodies developing from conception in their distinctive ways. Each contains sex glands—the ovaries in the female, the testes in the male—which produce eggs and sperm respectively, and in addition, secondary products known as male and female sex hormones. These hormones, checked and balanced by the products released by certain other glands, seem to control not only the process of sexual maturing but also the development of secondary sexual characteristics, such as body build, timbre of voice, hair distribution, and certain other physical attributes of sex. They exercise, then, a profound effect upon physical functioning, and apparently, at least among the lower animals, upon the related instinctive behavior necessary to race survival—though here again we are approaching controversial ground.

Influence of the Sex Glands

• Experiments with transplantation of male sex glands in female animals whose ovaries have been removed, and vice versa, have resulted in the development of male appearance, function, and behavior in the ex-females, and female appearance, function, and behavior in the ex-males. These changes include not only such physiological matters as milk secretion and suckling of young by a once-male guinea pig but also alterations in behavior, such as active courtship of females and aggression against rival males by a former female.

Human experiments have, of necessity, been much more limited, but they leave no doubt that secondary sexual characteristics, at least of a purely physical nature, are closely dependent upon the hormones secreted by the sex glands. The immense effect of suggestion in this sphere makes it impossible to draw accurate conclusions as to the psychological results in human subjects.

The functioning of all our glands is interrelated. They exercise stimulating or checking effects upon each other, and the balance established between their secretions is subject to considerable individual variation. Although we know that personality is closely related to this glandular balance, and that the sex hormones play an important part in determining what it shall be for each individual, the exact nature of their influence is still uncertain. Endocrinology—the science of glandular action—can as yet give no final answer to our question, but it yields enough evidence to suggest the possibility of temperamental sex differences closely dependent upon the functioning of the sex glands.

We turn next to anthropology for further light on our concept of the social factor. The study of varying cultures has indicated that many of our ideas and ideals, our choices and our basic assumptions are unconsciously derived from the culture around us. Social pressure, as a factor in determining the differences between men and women, must, then, be understood as including not only their deliberate education and training but also the much more subtle influence of sex tradition as it permeates the society in which they live. This has unquestionably influenced the psychology of every child from the day of its birth.

But as to just how heavily these cultural influences weight the scales, anthropologists disagree among themselves. Some investigators claim that the basic concept of temperamental differences between the sexes is a culturally imposed one, entirely absent in some societies, but exerting strong pressures in others; that comparison of results under varying traditions suggests "that many, if not all, of the personality traits which we have called masculine and feminine are as lightly linked to sex as are the clothing, the manners, and the form of head-dress that a society at a given period assigns to either sex," to quote Dr. Margaret Mead, a typical exponent of this group. Other anthropologists seem to feel, however, that such statements involve an exaggeration and are not entirely substantiated by an unbiased interpretation of the material on which they are based. It may be safe to say that scientific opinion, in general, while stressing the importance of cultural tradition, by no means claims for it such an all-important position in the determination of sex differences.

With some understanding of the physical and social factors, let us now examine the psychological evidence.

Psychological Findings

• The most significant result from the field of research psychology is a general agreement on the intellectual equality of men and women, so far as this can be measured by standardized laboratory tests, now highly developed and widely used. In total intellectual capacity and educability the sexes seem to be equal. Where differences in certain special capacities have been demonstrated—some favoring one sex and some the other—they are extremely slight and frequently there is greater variation within each sex group than between the two.

Many studies of girls and boys and men and

women show differences in personal-social behavior without, however, claiming to be able to distinguish whether these are innate or socially determined.

The many studies on the effect of the menses on the various functions of women have yielded conflicting results and endless argument.

Women and men score about the same on scales designed to measure neurotic make-up; and the data concerning differences in "suggestibility" between men and women are conflicting. The attempts to compare emotional reactions have ended largely in argument as to whether women were innately more emotional—whatever this term may mean—or whether they have been socially conditioned to display their emotions more readily.

Research psychology then has concerned itself mainly with *abilities* and *capacities*, and has shed little light on *drives* and *satisfactions*. Yet it is here probably that the most vital part of this inquiry centers.

The Emphasis Shifts

• It was natural, in the early days of feminism, when women were fighting for the right to be educated and to participate in the world's affairs, that attention should focus on the question of their comparative ability. Now this battle is largely won and they find themselves, though still under some social handicaps, in general, granted the right to pursue the same ends as men. At this point some of them are beginning to suspect that patterning their lives upon those of men may not lead to ultimate satisfaction. They are reconsidering the problem of sex difference on a new level, asking today not, "Are we men's equals?" but a much more profound question, "Are our major drives and satisfactions identical with those of men, or are they basically different—more deeply rooted in our biological functions than we had perhaps suspected?"

Realizing the depth of their own psychological reactions to the experiences of marriage and maternity, for example—the deepening within themselves of traditional feminine satisfactions at the expense of professional ambition and drive—they are impressed anew with the possibility that there may be some fundamental differences in sex psychology. Their own subjective experiences and their observation of the men and women about them, while certainly insufficient as a basis of scientific conclusion, have at least prompted deep speculation and a search for new sources of light.

Final answers may eventually come in part from increased knowledge of the physical basis of sexuality, in part from a deeper probing of the emotional life of men and women. This latter is peculiarly the province of the psychoanalysts. While they make no attempt at quantitative measurement and no pretense of complete knowledge, their penetrating insight into psycho-sexual experience carries considerable weight. But even among the psychoanalysts there is difference of opinion.

Psychoanalytic Contributions

• The Adlerians give most comfort to the feminists, stressing the inescapable sense of inferiority inculcated in every woman by the very fact of growing up a female in a man-dominated culture. This, to a large extent, they believe accounts for the readiness with which most women accept the passive role and for observed differences in ambition and accomplishment. They also suggest that it may account for woman's preoccupation with love goals and personal relationships—as an escape from the fields where she feels threatened by masculine competition.

Jung, on the other hand, suspects much more deep-rooted sex differences. Inherently a mystic, he suggests that there are masculine and feminine cosmic principles to which all life forms are related. Women, he believes, are basically identified with *Eros*, the principle of personal relationships; men with *Logos*, the principle of objective and factual interest. According to his findings, both masculine and feminine principles are present to some degree in all human beings, but ordinarily one predominates and the other remains largely dormant in the unconscious. If the dormant masculine quality in woman is admitted to consciousness and developed, she begins to seek masculine satisfactions, either in professional life or through dominating personal relationships, or both. Since, however, her basic femininity also demands satisfaction, considerable inner conflict results.

Repression of the feminine drives, as a way out of this conflict is the usual, because apparently at first the easiest, course. But since femininity is the stronger component of woman's nature, its repression results in a warping of personality and a sense of frustration or dissatisfaction. The achievement of a harmonious conscious relationship between the two active drives is a possible but difficult accomplishment. It is, however, the only permanently satisfying solution.

This theory is, of course, partly hypothetical—a tenable explanation of observed data. In many re-

spects it fits admirably what we know of the inner conflicts of modern women.

Freud, in discussing this same problem, frankly admits that it is not entirely possible, in the present state of scientific knowledge, to disentangle the social from the biological factors. One is tempted, he suggests, to label the active, aggressive drives masculine, the passive tendencies feminine, and to explain the obvious individual variations as due to a latent psychological bi-sexuality, which would correspond to the mixture of masculine and feminine attributes which apparently underlies the physical sex of all individuals. But such speculations may be seriously misleading, he warns us, especially since our knowledge of the development of biological bi-sexuality is still largely in the hypothetical stage.

Attributes of Feminine Maturity

• One can only state with accuracy, he feels, that women are for the most part identified with passive aims, men with active and aggressive ones—possibly instinctively following the model of their respective parts in the sex relation, and probably in part, at least, as the result of social pressures. The acceptance of the passive role, whether constitutionally or socially dictated, is an attribute of mature femininity and carries with it a desire for children and the ability to satisfy *through them* some of the remaining aggressive ambitions.

But the maturing process is a difficult one. It involves profound physiological and psychological changes. There are many points at which it may go astray, producing instead of the mature, well-adjusted woman, either the frigid or the highly aggressive type. The details of this development, which have been explored at some length, are too technical for discussion here. Suffice it to say that Freud finds that they exercise a profound effect upon character and personality, and suggests that both the girl's congenital make-up and the nature of her environment are involved in determining the outcome.

Biology, endocrinology, anthropology, psychology, and psychiatry—each has contributed something to our understanding—and each has confessed its knowledge to be incomplete. And so we end, as we began, by concluding that our question still remains to a large degree unanswered. Perhaps all that such an inquiry can hope to do is to help both men and women face honestly the various factors which contribute to their present psychological make-up, so that they may continue the search for their true sources of satisfaction with some regard for known facts and some respect for unexplored possibilities.

Woman's Stake in a Changing Social Order

By HARRY L. LURIE

AT THE turn of the century, Thorstein Veblen described the ideals of the good life for women as follows: "It is still felt that woman's life, in its civil, economic, and social bearing, is essentially and normally a vicarious life . . . any departure from the traditions of her assigned round of duties is unwomanly. . . . It is unfeminine in her to aspire to self-directing, self-centered life; and our common sense tells us that her direct participation in the affairs of the community, civil or industrial, is a menace to that social order which expresses our habits of thought as they have been formed under the guidance of the traditions of the pecuniary culture. . . . She is petted, and is permitted or even required to consume largely and conspicuously . . . she is exempted or debarred from vulgarly useful employment." This was the theoretical pattern which the feminists of the day were challenging in the face of repression and ridicule from the complacent and the conservative. According to Veblen, the major factor impelling women toward liberation and equality was a wholly normal desire for a more creative life. "But the woman is endowed with her share—of the instinct of workmanship, to which futility of life or of expenditure is obnoxious. . . . The impulse is perhaps stronger upon the woman than upon the man to live her own life in her own way and to enter the industrial process of the community at something nearer than the second remove." *

It is a far cry from the traditions of the cul-

* The Theory of the Leisure Class—Thorstein Veblen (1899).

ture described by Veblen to the place occupied by women in modern society today. One recognizes this fact more strikingly, for example, in the Soviet Union where the results of the modern attitude toward women's work unhampered by the traditions of the past are everywhere evident. In a recent visit there, I saw women participating in the work of building apartments, railroads, subways, canals, and other heavy tasks of industry and construction on a physical and economic parity with men. As in Western nations, women under the Soviets are still heavily represented in domestic and personal service, in teaching, nursing, and agriculture, but, unlike their Western sisters, they are encouraged rather than restrained from entering not only the learned professions, but also the newer professions of engineering, medicine, and the highly skilled mechanical trades. With the Soviet principle of glorifying all forms of useful labor, there appears to be no occupation considered unwomanly or unfeminine, and one meets women street cleaners, physicians, subway diggers, technical engineers, railroad conductors, and porters as frequently as teachers, waitresses, maids, clerks, or nurses.

Women in Pursuit of Their Jobs

• In our own country women have also been freeing themselves in part from the restrictions which limited their place in the working life of the community. This freedom in our own country has come, not because of a conscious revolution in our political and economic philosophy but primarily as the result of natural economic forces. As jobs departed from the household, women have pursued them into the factory, the office, and the community agency. Important cultural, economic, and psychological factors continue, however, to impede the process of satisfactory adjustment of women within the economic organization of our society.

Though the ideal of the women of leisure set the fashion for the 1890's, only the few could hope to attain it successfully. The majority of women found their life occupied with the unending tasks of the household. These, for many, were probably little better than drudgery, notwithstanding the compensations obtained from the embellishment of their households, the close relationships with their children, and from the socially sanctioned tasks of religious and group activities remaining for their scanty leisure. The unmarried, the widowed, and the child laborers were compelled, by circumstances, to earn their own living, and invariably at an economic disadvantage with men. Most of the women found it in the so-called "womanly" occupations of domestic and personal service and farm labor, together with dressmaking and millinery in the homes. When power machines replaced the hand worker in the clothing trades and other light industries, they went to the factories with their long hours and meager pay.

Since 1870, when about one out of every six women, sixteen years of age and over, was gainfully employed, there has been both an actual and proportionate increase so that in 1930 one out of every four was reported at work. It is significant that in recent years it is more often the older and the married woman rather than the young unmarried girl under twenty-one who is found in employment. The number of married working women in the last thirty years has increased fourfold, though the total number of women at work in the same period only doubled. In 1930, more than one out of nine married women was working outside the home. Except for the effect of the depression, not yet known statistically, this appears to be a growing tendency. The movement of women into jobs found them entering or seeking to enter occupations previously open only to men. Though the census lists them in nearly all the occupational classifications, in many fields a woman worker is the exception. Four out of five working women are to be found in twenty-four occupations. During the last three decades, women have gradually extended their range of employment formerly limited to domestic and personal service and agriculture to nursing, clerical, service, teaching, and retail selling. There have been limited increases in other trades and professions, but not large enough to indicate any general tendencies.

Sources of Restrictions

• Although traditional taboos against women's work have tended to diminish in the face of economic pressures and the natural desires of women to find gainful opportunities in the economic life of the community, strong social prejudices or perhaps the spontaneous choice of women themselves continue to restrict the number of women in certain occupations, particularly in the professions other than teaching and nursing. This is most marked in engineering and in the construction and skilled mechanical trades. We have yet to see any vocational effect upon girls of the mechanical and manual training which many are receiving in the modern schools. The "masculine" occupations, even before the onset of the depression, were considered as overcrowded and women were not recruited or welcomed in them. For a time, par-

ticularly during the war period, more opportunities were available to women in light industry. With the return of unemployment and the competition with men for jobs, women have been increasingly crowded into the more poorly paid type of factory work. It is indeed the exceptional woman who becomes an executive, lawyer, physician, office holder, or civil servant in the higher categories.

Since the depression, renewed restrictions and prejudices operate to limit opportunities for women in the more desirable gainful occupations, though the low wage sweatshops may still prefer them. Married women are at a disadvantage in a number of occupations, particularly in public service even though the basis for such restrictions may be illegal. In addition to unemployment among women resulting from the depression and the restrictions upon women holding jobs, there is also a new factor in unemployment arising from increasing numbers of women seeking employment because of the reduced incomes of their families.

Not only have traditional attitudes and economic limitations placed obstacles in the path of women's work but women have also encountered many difficulties because home responsibilities and the demands of the job are frequently incompatible. This imposes an impossible burden upon the woman who seeks to combine both careers. Though modern industry and urban living have tended to diminish the number and kind of tasks required for the maintenance of the household and for the rearing of children, married women are socially handicapped for the majority of jobs. The problem is not removed in spite of the fact that education, health services, and recreation are organized, that laundry and, to some extent, food preparation are performed outside of the home or are considerably reduced in scope within the home. Neither the arrangements of family living nor the job requirements are such as to facilitate outside occupations by married women, particularly where the family is unable to afford adequate domestic help or where the children are too young to share the household tasks.

Special Provisions Needed for Working Women

• Industry makes few concessions to the special needs of working women who are responsible wholly or in part for home management. Neither has the problem been adequately met by community contributions to home management. Day nurseries and other philanthropic institutions are for the underprivileged woman who works because of economic pressure. Schools, kindergartens, playgrounds, and similar provisions, while they relieve the mother of some of her responsibilities, do not diminish the tasks sufficiently so that an employed woman is not overburdened with more labor than is healthful or desirable. Frequently, these social agencies provide for only a part of the child's daily program. Even in the Soviet Union, where social facilities have been developed on a comprehensive scale, and where the feeding of children and adults is cared for in part by school and factory arrangements, working wives and mothers, in many instances, are expected to carry the additional tasks of the evening meal preparation, care of children, and preparation of meals on rest days. Other minor, but time and effort consuming responsibilities for the household are rarely equitably shared between husband and wife. No matter how arduous her work outside the home, the mother of the family inevitably bears also the active management of home and children. Another problem for the working mother lies in the interruption of work during the period of child bearing which is not met entirely by the social provisions for maternity leaves with pay, or the special factory and office arrangements for nursing mothers.

One does not need to prepare an elaborate case to show the necessity for social and economic arrangements which would enable married women to engage in gainful occupations outside of their homes, while not neglecting their obligations as women and as mothers. The need primarily corresponds with the strong desire which women themselves have to join in productive work for which the restricted range of household tasks frequently supplies inadequate satisfactions. In the simpler households, where the family income is small and there is a strong compulsion for wage earning, women without children or with children of school age often find themselves in the vacuum of undesired leisure—that most painful type of unemployment. Even where the family income is more favorable and women have found it possible to employ domestic help, the unsatisfied urge for productive activity in a sphere larger than their own homes has made of these women, too, a social problem. Industry with its eight-hour day or longer, and its insistence thus far upon regularity and continuity of work, offers few opportunities for women who cannot or should not relinquish their remaining household functions. Much has been said and written about the part-time job, but industry in general has

turned a deaf ear to this entirely legitimate desire of the married woman.

The Middle-Aged Woman: A Special Problem

• The problem becomes particularly acute for women of forty and over whose children are well on the way to self-sufficiency in their school and community contacts. The middle class woman with her domestic servant and her grown children finds herself at a serious disadvantage. Though she possesses adequate physical and mental vigor, and pleasant memories of her former vocational interests, it is well-nigh unattainable for her to gain a satisfactory foothold in outside occupations. Her training and her vocational experience, previous to marriage, have become antiquated or rusty through lack of use. She finds it difficult to start a new process of vocational education or to enroll with the beginners in tasks which carry with them small rewards and less prestige. The problems of the woman over forty are not unlike those of the older man who seeks to return to work after a long period of involuntary or voluntary unemployment. Only the exceptionally endowed woman or the wife of the poor provider, compelled by inner or outer necessity to return to work is likely to accept the conditions offered. The result is that few middle class middle-aged women work.

Failing to find gainful occupations, many middle-aged women, particularly of the privileged economic classes, attempt to fill up their unoccupied time with volunteer effort or with club and group activities that are rarely satisfactory to them or to the causes which they serve. It is the unusual woman who can perform these volunteer tasks expertly and effectively. For the majority of women, these substitute interests represent one of the worst forms of "boondoggling" permitted by society only because they cost nothing, and because so little is actually attempted or accomplished in many of these voluntary activities. There remains the unprofitable leisure time activities of these women. These activities involve expenditures which may be profitable to the luxury trades and services, the travel tours, the purveyors of paraphernalia for parties and club life, the leaders of cults, and the various professionals who specialize in therapy for neurotics. If not accompanied by overeating, an individual with nothing but leisure may remain physically vigorous if he combines a sufficient amount of physical exercise with the pursuit of fads and fancies. As more women, however, attempt to reject this kind of life and seek jobs which have some meaning we shall begin to see that in addition to the present volume of unemployment estimated at eleven million we actually have a much greater problem of joblessness among women.

The need for a remaking of our economic set-up in order to solve the occupational problems of women is being increasingly recognized. Women of intelligence are beginning to see more clearly the need for a change in social organization which will solve the problem of unemployment and of a potential surplus of labor of both men and women. They recognize that such an economic reorganization bringing with it a vast increase in vocational opportunities is not likely to emerge from the control of private enterprise. What is needed is an economic plan capable of utilizing the unused resources of labor which men and women would only be too willing to contribute to productive society if work were properly organized and distributed. Such a planned system of work must wait upon a socialized economy able to use all of the potential skills and to distribute the tasks properly to achieve an optimum rather than a restricted output of goods and services.

Our capacity to produce which has been curtailed by the depression was never fully utilized even in the most prosperous periods. Only through such a dynamic system can jobs which are both useful to society and adapted to women's own needs evolve naturally. The problem of the work of women, particularly of married women, however, cannot be entirely solved by the provision of an increasing number of jobs and proper distribution of work. Special provisions are required to enable women to combine their home making and child rearing duties with the tasks of productive work and service. Special arrangements are needed in industry, in family life, and in home services established in each neighborhood to make possible the fulfilment and continuity of women's work.

It is for these reasons that women even more than men must remain dissatisfied with the economic and political *status quo*. Once they have fully grasped the situation they will not rest until a revolution in our whole economic structure has been accomplished. And they will find that a reordering of the social and economic system which releases effectively the productive forces of the nation and solves the problem of unemployment for men will bring with it those opportunities for creative work and a richer life which are now so generally denied to women.

Parents' Questions and Discussion

STUDY GROUP DEPARTMENT
Cécile Pilpel, Director—Anna W. M. Wolf, Editor

• *This department invites your questions on the subjects to be discussed in coming issues:* Children's Reading, Science Contributes, Freedom and Routine, *and* The Cardinal Virtues Today. *Discussion of your questions may prove helpful not only to other individual parents but also for use in study group work.*

I have been looking forward to sending my baby to nursery school, both because I think she needs the group experience and because I will welcome the opportunity to go on with my own professional work which her constant care precludes. But my husband objects so vigorously to both these ideas that I begin to wonder whether I am an unnatural mother in being willing to relinquish my baby so early. (She is almost three.) What ought I to do?

You are not an unnatural mother. What you ought to do depends upon an examination of your husband's attitude and your own. Your husband's objection to nursery schools may be based merely on a false conception of them, or fancied dangers which might be dispelled by a visit to a good school, or a talk with a well-informed nursery educator. But more often such masculine protest against nursery school is due to the need, often unconscious, which some men have to keep their wives dependent on them, not only for their material satisfactions but for the spiritual ones as well. Anchoring the wife to the home serves this end. Where this is so, the opposition cannot be met by arguments for nursery school or for women's careers, for these are merely the symbols of the wife's freedom. If this is so in your case, consider the possibility of an honest discussion in which you present the benefits to a child of the group experience and the compatibility in yourself of the desire for professional work and the more usual feminine pursuits. Clarification of such conflicts between husband and wife are not to be arrived at in one or two conversations. It may therefore be wise to waive the nursery school question for the present and center your energy on the larger issue, your relationship to your husband. If you are successful in this, all the other problems bound to arise continuously in family living will then be met with greater ease and on a more objective level. Certainly you need have no guilt feelings about being away from your child. Your affection and care for your child cannot be measured by the number of hours you spend with her.

I have noticed a tendency on the part of many people to turn up their noses at the part time or volunteer work performed by many women, especially in America, and to regard it as mere "busy work"—something to give them the illusion of usefulness. Is this the whole story? Is it not possible for many women not under economic pressure, whose homes have ceased to occupy their time fully, to give their services in genuinely useful channels? Has not volunteer community work of various kinds a real and permanent claim to respect?

It can scarcely be doubted that voluntary efforts in behalf of hospital funds, community chests, school boards, "progressive" and "experimental" movements of various kinds, have accomplished much of real importance. Women thus engaged often possess a high degree of intelligence and devotion, and we have them to thank for much to which we point with pride. Moreover, the present structure of society and the traditions in which women have grown up, often make such work the only kind open to them. Whether it has a permanent place is another matter. The "handwriting on the wall" might seem to some to indicate that in the not too distant future, women, even women of the privileged classes, may have no choice in the matter, and that like men, a "full time job"—either within their homes or without—may be expected of them. Meanwhile, as women struggle to find their place in the scheme of things, there is no reason to feel contemptuous when they seize upon the only avenues which *for them* and *at the moment* seem feasible, and which may also prove to be an entering wedge to real achievement.

Now that it is no longer a novelty for women to be at work in industry and the professions, what is the verdict, if any, as to the effects of such work on their homes, children and married happiness? One hears that divorce is more prevalent among couples when the woman works outside the home, and that delinquency rates for the children are higher too. Even if working women arrange to have their homes efficiently and intelligently run, is there not bound to be a loss in those elements which though intangible, are nevertheless of such importance?

Most married women who are earning a living or seriously contributing to the family budget at the same time that they are wives and mothers of young children, will, if they are honest, recognize the conflict both inner and outer which is involved in this course. Yet perhaps this is no more than to say that our life choices, whatever they are, involve us in conflicts of one kind or another. The woman holding a responsible professional job sometimes longs to be at home "hemming curtains," while the full-time home-maker envies the "interesting" life which she fancies her sister to be leading. Certainly there are some women today who have demonstrated their ability for both out-of-the-home work and successful family life with children and husband free of deep resentments toward their "careers."

I suspect that the secret of success lies not in the efficiency or even the intelligence with which a woman organizes her life, though these things surely count. Far more important is the clarity with which she recognizes home interests as possessing the deeper claim on her emotions. If her heart is fully in her home, if she realizes beyond a shadow of a doubt that love and home-making lie at the center of her life and that other things, though necessary or desirable, hold second place, her career, however active and time consuming, is unlikely to cause her to neglect her home in any significant sense. The paradox of the situation, however, is that this very necessary attitude of mind is bound to place women at a disadvantage with men in the competitive struggle for economic advancement or professional prestige. Yet if they have recognized and duly honored their own special creativeness as women they are less likely to begrudge men those other advantages. Competition between men and women for the same kinds of success has had a poisonous effect upon relationships between men and women, and modern marriage is badly in need of a purging of that element of envy and rivalry, which has been one of the less desirable results of the "emancipation" of women. Furthermore, only when women understand themselves better as women will their careers represent the best which they have to give to society.

As for divorce rates being higher in families where the woman works outside the home, one surely cannot reason that this fact is the cause of the marital unhappiness. Such reasoning may err in placing the cart before the horse. And similarly with delinquency among the children. More frequently than the reverse, it is the bad home conditions which drive the wife to seek outside work either as economic necessity or as an escape from her own unhappiness.

In no class of society have women, except perhaps in individual cases, as yet found a successful solution to their dual rôle in life; nevertheless it is a problem infinitely worth working on. Not only must industry make adjustments to women workers in the interests of the home but women themselves must come to grips with their own deepest needs with a clarity of vision which has thus far been lacking.

I feel rather foolish asking help in what really should not be a "problem," and yet I am puzzled about the situation which I find myself in, and would welcome your advice. My husband has a good income and we live as comfortably as I could wish. I have two normal healthy children—eight and ten—and everything runs reasonably smoothly in my life. Yet I look about me at my friends who have jobs—many doing important professional work—and I feel that I am simply doing nothing with my life, just being supported. I have no training for any particular work, yet I feel passionately that I must do something to "earn my salt." How can I go about it?

There are many women who feel as you do, partly because they find, with the children at school, that home-making is no longer a full-time job, and that they have many leisure hours to fill. But partly, too, their dissatisfaction is engendered by the over-sale of "careers for women" in the last few decades. There is no reason why being a good wife, mother, and home-maker isn't "earning one's salt" in an altogether worthy and dignified sense. Why should "earning" be purely monetary? If you mean that in spots it grows boresome—that it isn't exciting—so does any job. It might help you to take careful note of some of your working friends' lives—the daily details as well as some of the cumulative effects. You would find, I am sure, much that is not glamorous, even much that would be difficult or repugnant.

There is no elixir of happiness in a professional job. There is, however, a human need to be usefully busy. Can you not find, among your own interests, some which you could pursue either as hobbies or as useful service? This would solve the problem of your leisure time without committing you to a program in which you have no genuine interest. It might be helpful for you to come to a definite conclusion as to just what it is that you are envying these other women. Is it their freedom and self-assurance, or the fact that they have contact with people who are active in creative work of social significance, and the stimulating effect this would have on your own growth and mental development?

These are things of the spirit and may be arrived at by means that are closer at hand. If you succeed in thus clarifying your thinking and feeling in regard to your dissatisfactions, you may at the same time find yourself on the way to solving the problem.

All my friends who have married about the same time as I did have babies. Of course I would like to have one too, and I am beginning to feel very much out of it all. My husband is just getting established in his business and feels that this is no time to add anything more to the budget. Since he is the one who carries the financial burden I don't want to add to his labor. But I am still breaking my head to find a way.

Your wanting to keep up with your friends in the baby race makes me wonder whether you may also be keeping up with them in other ways, in rent, in clothes, and in entertaining, for instance. Is it possible that you might change your present style of living in such a way that the baby cost could come out of some of the other budgeted items? Your sympathetic attitude toward your husband promises at least a ray of hope toward the realization of your desire. He may even warm to the idea of your having the baby if he finds you willing to reduce your other living expenses. This depends, of course, on whether this is possible. Children do demand, if not sacrifices, at least a continuous balancing of desires on the part of parents. Shall I have a new dress or fur coat, or use the money for the children's dental care? Shall we for their sakes live in the city or country? Shall we join a country club or send our children to a private school?

It might be well, therefore, for you to come to terms with your desires. Do you both want a baby enough to relinquish some of the other things that your friends may have?

(*Continued on page 62*)

Suggestions for Study: Women in Conflict

TOPICAL OUTLINE

1. MEN AND WOMEN

   Recent changes in woman's social position.

   Historical background; disappearance of her former work at home, due to industrial changes, small families, etc.

   New conception of herself as having rights and capacities equal to man's. Effect of this on her relationship to man.

   Are men and women similar in their temperamental and psychological make-ups? Are such differences as exist based upon biological differences or due entirely to culture and tradition?

2. WOMEN IN THE HOME

   Homes of today—comparison with homes of our grandmother's day. Differences between the good homemaker of today and yesterday. Educating women to be "home-makers."

   Children—Unique responsibility of women toward their children. How many children does a woman want? Advantages and disadvantages for women in being free to choose the number of their children.

   Husband and wife—Sources of marital friction today; envy and rivalry between the sexes. Woman's greater stake in marriage. Unique responsibility of women toward marriage.

3. WOMEN AND JOBS

   Increasing tendency for women to seek employment outside the home: causes; consequences for home and industry.

   Can a woman successfully combine an outside job with home-making?

   Attitude of husbands toward their wives' jobs; attitude of children toward their working mothers.

   The volunteer job; the part-time job; possible adjustments.

4. WHITHER THE AMERICAN FAMILY

   Facts about families in America today. The falling birth rate; the rising divorce rate; the problem of the single woman. Can we rebuild a family life which will be sound and satisfying? Possible means to this end.

Readers' Slants

• We herewith present some contributions of our readers who have been thinking about child training and learning through both study and experience. We, the editors, may disagree with what is said as frequently as we approve it. But in either case, we feel that the writers have a point of view which may prove stimulating to our readers. Anyone with something to say which may interest parents or teachers is cordially invited to send a contribution. In addition, we would welcome your comments on whatever appears in this column.

We Do Not Love Our Children

ALL parents love their children all the time—so runs the common assumption. There is overwhelming testimony to its weakness, for not uncommonly parents behave toward their children in a way that shows not love but envy, malice, and all uncharitableness. True, very few do so all of the time; some never do so; but there are enough parents who sometimes make their own and their children's lives miserable, for almost any reader, however strongly he may have embraced the assumption of unfailing parental love, to allow that the description is not exaggerated.

But there is no general recognition of the paradox, much less any attempt to explain it. When such behavior occurs, the modern psychologist prescribes a course in parent education; the more innocent bystander refuses to believe the evidence of his senses and assures himself that the parent is manifesting love in a slightly peculiar manner; and the less innocent (novelists and philosophers) record the facts and let it go at that.

There is no reason, however, why the phenomenon should remain unexplained, for it is easy enough to construct a theory to account for it, drawing only upon evidence that has been under our noses for many years. Novelists, philosophers, psychologists, parents, and children, have all contributed to it by implication. All that is necessary is to group their comments together and to make them explicit.

To state the theory in its simplest form: Parents love, not their real child but a symbol that stands in place of him, a symbol erected by their own unconscious needs and desires. This symbol acts as a barrier between parent and child, and as its existence is not suspected, it is the cause of the selfish or cruel behavior which does violence to the ancient assumptions regarding the eternal and all-pervasive nature of parental affection.

To some parents the child represents personal immortality brought down to its most concrete manifestation. To others he is the tie that binds husband and wife together in a union otherwise without personal significance. Still others regard offspring as proof of their participation in one of Nature's greatest mysteries—birth—a participation that gives them a sense of heroic importance. Some parents never see their children as other than extensions of themselves, flesh of their flesh, bone of their bone. Finally, the child can be an assurance to the parent that he has reached maturity and placed himself on a level with all other responsible adults.

First consider the child as the symbolic representation of immortality. Humanity has a deep longing for existence beyond the grave. Witness man's vehement pursuit of fame, glory, illustrious deeds—all because they hold the promise of prolonging life into eternal time. The child is another of the ways through which this longing can be satisfied, as noted by Plato in the Symposium: "Those whose bodies alone are pregnant with (the) principle of immortality are attracted by women, seeking through the production of a child what they imagine to be happiness, *immortality,* and an enduring remembrance."

Any number of women have testified to the identification of immortality and maternity. Take, for instance, Romola Nijinsky's blunt statement regarding the great dancer: "If ever his genius should be perpetuated, I wanted to be the medium of this transmission."

The parent to whom the child is a symbol of the Tie That Binds is easily recognized. Everyone has known wives who have tried to hold wandering husbands by this method. Recognition that children play this rôle is so common that friends of a divorced and childless couple invariably moan that if there had only been a child, the disaster would have been averted. The idea is so popular that it has merited inclusion in any number of plays, in which the wife

brings an erring husband back to her side by producing offspring in the third act. And many parents who hate each other frankly admit they remain together "for the sake of the children."

It is not so easy to spot the parent who regards his child as a symbol of participation in one of Nature's mysteries. Broadly speaking, this is the way of mothers. By giving birth to a child, they associate with that majestic figure, Death, and in consequence they feel important and heroic. Therefore they arrogate to themselves the entire creative process.

As soon as the child is born the mother speaks of it as "my baby," with the emphasis on the possessive pronoun. Though she lives to see her child a bald-headed man of fifty, he is still her baby, not himself but what *she* brought forth from the valley of the shadow of death.

Commenting on this kind of mother-love, one psychologist has said: "It is of an almost animal-like quality which cannot be called love of the child, of the object, at all. The child represents to such a mother a little piece of herself which has become separated and which she passionately loves on account of the still unbroken bond with herself."

We can all recall parents who say: "My child is going to have all the things I never had." The phrase seems to indicate devotion, but when the behavior of such a parent is examined critically, it becomes apparent that he means only that he wants for his child, not what the child himself may want but precisely and specifically what he, the parent, never had a chance to enjoy. In so many words he actually says so, but blinded by the common assumption about the wholeheartedness of parental affection, the listener attaches to the statement an altruistic significance it does not possess. In fact, it is thoroughly egotistical, for this parent means to give an extension of himself everything which for one reason or another was denied him. Dominated by the symbol which stands between himself and his child, he never stops to reflect that his child's desires and satisfactions are not identical with those of his own frustrated ego.

Lastly, the child may symbolize for the parent his own maturity. The fact of parenthood answers his need to be grown up and he assures himself that he is now on a plane of equality with all others who have experienced parenthood, with, most important of all, his own parents. If his childhood has been happy, he may feel obligated to make his own child happy; if it has not, then by the cruel system of logic practiced by the unconscious, the child may become an object upon which he revenges the suffering and frustration to which he was subjected by his own parents. The attitude is expressed in the tragic commonplace: "What was good enough for me is good enough for my children. Why should they have anything better than I had?"

These, then, are the five symbols that apparently play a decisive rôle in the behavior of parents. Looked at in this way, family life becomes a drama played by four actors, only three of them real. The fourth actor, the symbol, may be the most powerful of all, for it is the one toward which the parent's affection is directed. It is the creation of his deepest needs and desires.

All the ideals, hopes, fears, and ambitions of the parent are projected upon the child. He is assimilated by the parent organism, endowed with the parental processes rather than his own. The parents behave toward him cruelly or kindly, generously or hatefully, according to whether or not he responds to the demands which the symbol is expected to gratify.

The child does not know what is wrong. He knows only that at times, for no reason he can discover, he pleases his parents, at others disappoints them inexplicably. Mystery and obscurity cloud his relationship with those nearest and dearest to him. All the child can do is weep, or be hurt, or fight back. If he does the latter, he is called ungrateful, contrary, stubborn, difficult, or moody, and the familiar family situation of tension between parent and child sets in.

Americans are such unabashed pragmatists that they always demand, "What is to be done about it, granting the theory is true?" The answer is that the origin and development of the desire for children needs investigation. If we could correlate our present understanding of the child—won through the work of hundreds of patient investigators into the mental and emotional processes of children—with an understanding of the parent *qua* parent, we might look hopefully toward formulas of child-training that would be more infallible.

That hidden motives occasion parenthood, that conflicting desires drive parents to erect symbols in place of their children, might as well be acknowledged. Then comes the task of finding ways to deal with the situation so exposed. It is a task, to quote Dr. Freud, "like the draining of the Zuyder Zee." That the Zuyder Zee has finally been drained in our day should give us hope that in the not too distant future parental affection will cease to be a paradox.

MARIA LAMBIN ROGERS

Science Contributes

CONVALESCENT SERUMS IN MEASLES AND SCARLET FEVER

By DR. WILLIAM THALHIMER

MEASLES is usually considered a mild disease, inconvenient but inevitable. Therefore, it might be surprising to learn that in infants up to one year of age, who contract measles, the mortality rate is 8 per cent, in the one to two-year age group 5 per cent, in those from two to three years old 1.5 per cent, and from three to five years old, 3 per cent. These fatalities are caused mainly by the not uncommon serious complications of measles, such as pneumonia, mastoiditis, etc. But from ten years of age on the mortality rate is much less, yet not insignificant, *i.e.*, 0.1 per cent to 0.2 per cent. Stated in another way, 95 per cent of all deaths from measles occur in children four years old and under. Accordingly, the older a child is when accidentally infected with measles, the less likely he is to suffer serious complications or death. One further illustration, quoted from Godfrey, is very illuminating. In New York State, from 1915-1924 there were 35,930 cases of measles reported among children under three years of age, in places of less than 200,000 population. Of these, 1,441 died, a fatality rate of 4 per cent. Had these attacks of measles been postponed until the children were between 5 and 14 years old, only 54 would have died and the lives of 1,387 children in this group would have been saved. In other words, if there were a method which did no more than allow one to postpone measles until after children reached their fifth year, many lives could be saved. Apparently, it is not generally known that such a method does exist. If used within five days after exposure, it can prevent the disease in up to 95 per cent of those exposed, thereby postponing the contraction of measles till the children are older and in a more resistant age group when again accidentally exposed. The method has the further advantage, that if used within one week after exposure it can modify the infection to a mild, attenuated measles, practically sure to be free from serious complications. This attenuated measles is often so mild that it is difficult to diagnose, and yet the attenuated attack apparently confers sufficient permanent active immunity to prevent the disease occurring again.

This procedure is only beginning to be utilized extensively in this country, and yet Dr. William H. Park in 1916 in New York, and in the same year Nicolle and Conseil abroad, demonstrated its effectiveness on a large scale. This is another example of the period of lag between the advance in scientific knowledge and its practical utilization in preventing disease and death.

The method is simple in principle, easy to use, harmless, and comparatively inexpensive.

The principle is based on the fact that since second attacks of measles in the same individuals are almost unknown, the disease must cause a permanent resistance or immunity. This is called active immunity, in contradistinction to passive immunity, such as is conferred by a prophylactic injection of diphtheria antitoxin, which lasts only a few weeks. Temporary passive immunity, however, is efficient in preventing infection after a specific exposure, and is useful and important until research discovers a way of inducing permanent active immunity, such as the discovery of the strong, long-term resistance to diphtheria produced by injections of diphtheria toxoid.

Because of the immunity which follows measles it was thought that the blood of individuals convalescent from or recently recovered from this disease would be found to contain substances which, when injected into others, would prevent them from contracting this highly contagious malady even after intimate contact. Direct trial demonstrated this logical conclusion to be correct. The protective substances are present in large amounts in the blood for at least four months after an individual has recovered from measles, and in smaller amounts for the rest of his or her life. Since blood is fragile and deteriorates quickly it is fortunate that the more stable serum, the clear fluid which separates on clotting, also contains these immune substances in large amounts. This is called "convalescent serum" or "immune human serum" and can be kept in an ice-box for at least a year without losing its effectiveness. It has been found that this convalescent serum, when carefully and properly prepared, does not cause reactions nor sensitize children to subsequent injections, as is the not infrequent result from serums prepared from animals. The reason for this is that the proteins in human serum are not foreign proteins to another human, whereas animal proteins are.

It has been shown that the maximum percentage of prevention is achieved only if the serum is injected intramuscularly within five days after exposure. The minimum dose for children three years old or less is three cubic centimeters (less than a teaspoonful), and for older children one cubic centimeter for every year of their age. Prevention can then be expected in from 70 per cent to 95 per cent of the injected children. Even in those instances where complete prevention does not occur, a modified and attenuated attack will occur in all but 3 per cent to 5 per cent of the total group. One can readily see the advantage of limiting measles in healthy children to this mild disease with its subsequent immunity. As a matter of fact, attenuation should be the method of choice except in debilitated or sick children, in children five years of age or less, and in children exposed accidentally in hospitals and institutions. The reason for attempting complete protection in all children not over five years old, even though they are robust and in good health, is that the mortality from measles is confined mainly to this lower age group.

The full dose of serum has some chance of preventing the disease even if administered between the fifth and seventh day after exposure, and even if it fails to prevent the disease, usually causes attenuation. On and after the eighth day of exposure very little benefit can be expected.

If attenuation rather than prevention is the course decided upon, it is advisable to wait until the sixth or seventh day after exposure before giving the full dose of serum, or better still, since valuable serum is thus saved, one-half the full dose at any time up to the fifth day of exposure may be given.

It also is well known that pooled normal adult serum is just as efficient in the prophylaxis of measles as the specific convalescent serum, but it must be used in four times the amount, and normal whole blood in about eight times the quantity. The disadvantage in using normal serum is the larger amount which must be injected. The efficiency of adult serum is fortunate, for, with properly organized facilities, an unlimited supply of normal serum can always be maintained, although adequate amounts of convalescent serum for protecting all young children can be obtained in any city with an organization designed for this purpose.

The blood is obtained from adult donors by simple puncture, with a small needle, of the vein at the bend of the elbow. Each bleeding yields 110 cubic centimeters of serum, enough to prevent the disease in at least eleven children. Men can act as donors every two weeks, and women every three weeks, not only without any bad effect or lowering of their hemoglobin but with an actual increase in their hemoglobin, as we have found by tests made before each bleeding. Since an average of six bleedings can be obtained during the first four months after recovery, each donor can contribute enough serum to prevent measles in sixty-six children.

The blood and serum are processed with rigorous attention to the regulations of the United States Public Health Service. The serum obtained from thirty individuals is pooled together, passed through a sterile Berkefeld filter, and is then put into sterile vials. Serum is used only after it has been proved negative to the Wassermann test and after careful bacteriological tests have found it to be sterile.

Convalescent scarlet fever serum is similarly prepared from adults recently recovered from scarlet fever. Injections of small amounts of this serum will prevent the disease in more than 90 per cent of the children expected to contract it because of contact with an infectious individual in the home.

Besides this prophylactic value, this convalescent serum has definite value in treatment. When administered early, the scarlet fever not infrequently is dramatically terminated in from twelve to twenty-four hours. While this rapid benefit does not always occur, the results in the majority of cases are excellent, with an average fall in temperature of three degrees observed in about 1,000 treated cases, accompanied by relief of sore throat, fading of rash, and early convalescence. The number and severity of complications are greatly reduced. Even patients admitted to the hospital late, with severe complications already developed, are usually helped by treatment with convalescent serum.

In recent years convalescent serum laboratories have been organized in Detroit, Chicago, Philadelphia, Milwaukee, Providence, and a few other cities. Aided by the interest of Dr. Park, Commissioner Rice, and Dr. Muckenfuss, and the grant of funds by the New York, Friedsam, and Hofheimer Foundations, the Manhattan Convalescent Serum Laboratory was organized this year and began work in May. This laboratory is located in the Research Laboratory of the Department of Health, at the foot of East 15th Street, and is cooperating with the Department of Health, Willard Parker Hospital, and private physicians in the convalescent serum field. It is also conducting research in the control and treatment of measles and scarlet fever, and a number of other infectious diseases by means of convalescent serums.

SHOP TALK

THE problem of keeping babies and young children under a cover which would be loose yet stay put without twisting has been solved by many ingenious sleeping bags with coy trade names, but of undeniable efficiency. Both Bloomingdale's and Hearn's show the "Nodkin" and "Kuddler" slumber bags which tie to the crib sides and cover everything except baby's head. The top fits like a sweater and the arm extensions allow ample room for freedom of movement. The lower part can even be pulled up to form a wrap-around skirt when the child is standing. These come in washable cotton blanket cloth in varying weights. There are also very roomy *Mun-Robe* sleeping bags, large enough to tie under the mattress, with zipper fastening down the front to make diaper changing easy. These come in sizes to fit small or large cribs, and in blanket cloth or all wool materials.

A very useful and popular item at Bloomingdale's and Hearn's is the new Dennison's "baby pads" which are inserted in diapers to save them from soiling. These tissues are prepared with cocoa butter to prevent chafing. They also have *Chux,* completely disposable diapers made of tissues with gauze on the outside making them firm enough for pinning. Bloomingdale's carries *Diapex,* which requires no pins but has cardboard tabs on one end and strings on the other, so that baby ties up somewhat in the manner of a manila envelope. These disposable diapers are a great convenience when visiting or traveling, but are too expensive for regular daily use.

The neatest way out of the diaper washing situation is not to wash any at all. The past few years have seen the growth of a number of firms which supply a regular delivery service of washed and sterilized diapers. It is claimed that considering the initial cost of the diapers, soap, gas, maid service, etc., this new method is not only more sanitary (attested by the fact that it is used by most hospitals now) but actually cheaper than having them done at home. Anyone who has had to dry diapers in a city apartment can appreciate the boon of such a service. The best way to insure a diaper service whose methods have been thoroughly investigated is to secure the name of a firm used by your local maternity hospital, such as the *General Diaper Service* or *Babies Diaper Service,* two firms which supply many of the private hospitals in New York.

Noted at Bloomingdale's

Home-from-the-hospital imported sets of extra soft hand-knit sweaters, caps and booties to match. ($5.95-$6.95)

Zippers have crept even into underwear and pajamas. Underwear for boys and girls from 2 to 12 with zipper front and lastex backs in varying weights. Also zipper flannelette pajamas with back seat controlled by front ties. ($1.69)

Girl's tweed reefer coat, sizes 10-16, specially treated to be waterproof and with *chamoline* lining for extra warmth and protection against the wind. ($19.75)

Large selection of 2 to 6 self-help dresses and suits with zippers down the front. ($1.95)

Very attractive real Swedish ski sweaters trimmed with a red, white, and black design like Swedish cross-stitch embroidery. ($5.95)

Noted at Hearn's

A new model of Vanta baby shirts with special neckline of over-lapping sides. Without strings or other fastening, for quick dressing. Cotton or part wool. ($.74 to $.94)

"Circlastic" pajamas with adjustable back and soft elastic band in front. No strings to tie. For boys and girls from 2 to 14. ($.79 to $.98)

Set of pantie and bib in white or pastel *Latex*—a new material softer and cooler than ordinary rubber. Attractively boxed in a silver chest and nice for a small gift. ($1.00)

Hearn's own model of training pants in cotton, with fitted front and elastic back for only $.29.

Bathrobe and slipper set in Esmond blanket cloth, with hard soled slippers to match bathrobe. In sizes 1 to 3. ($1.94)

In answer to our plea for children's bathrobes which would be warm, not bulky, and easily washable, our attention has been called to robes available at the Women's Exchange, 541 Madison Avenue, New York, of a fine quality lightweight imported woolen material which tubs very well. These cost $7.75, and they can also be specially ordered (8 weeks to fill) directly from the maker, Carolyn Bailey Miller, 1239 Madison Avenue, with the name of the child embroidered on the pocket.

P. R. F.

News and Notes

International Educational Conference

Mrs. Sidonie M. Gruenberg, Director of the Child Study Association of America, gave a course on Family Relations this summer at the World Conference of the New Educational Fellowship in Cheltenham, England, and reports:

"It was my good fortune to be present at three successive world conferences of the New Education Fellowship—1929, 1932, and 1936. The current of world affairs was unmistakably reflected in the subjects discussed, in the attitudes of the participants, and in the prevailing moods. The Nice gathering, in 1932, for example, came at a time when the whole world was feeling the economic depression and apprehending further declines, but it was nevertheless a more joyous group than this year's. For some of the calamities of the intervening years had not been anticipated. At Nice there had been delegates from Germany; the meaning of their absence from Cheltenham could not be overlooked. The Spanish situation cast shadows in all directions. The Cheltenham meeting was inevitably more self-conscious and more sober, aware of the obstacles to peace not alone in the international conflicts but in the very nature of our civilization.

"From the point of view of the Child Study Association of America and of our interest in parent education, the Cheltenham meeting was in many ways most gratifying. Here the program found a place for 'family life' as a vital and integral part of its major theme, rather than as a minor incident deserving some attention from educators. The general topic of the conference, Education and a Free Society, divided itself naturally into two major problems—the free personality, and the social or community setting and relationships. And in the discussion of both of these the family was conspicuous.

"The program itself had to a degree anticipated this. One of the main addresses was by Susan Isaacs, on 'Personal Freedom and Family Life.' There was a symposium under the same title the following night. The International Federation of Home and School had arranged two public meetings and three group discussions: cooperation between home and school, parent education, the home and other community agencies. At the larger of these meetings, presided over by Miss Ishbel MacDonald, short papers were read by Dr. Ralph H. Crowley, of London, Dr. Fritz Redl of Vienna, Madame Maria de Bolaghy of Budapest, and myself. From the very nature of the main concern with personality and social adjustment, the rôle of the family, the interaction of personalities, child guidance, and parent education, came constantly to the fore.

"Dr. Chang Peng-Chun of Nankai University, in discussing 'Intercultural Contacts and Creative Adjustments in the Modern World,' pierced the complacency of those whose missionary zeal drives them to 'civilizing' other people, and at the same time allayed the fears of those who shun more friendly relations among peoples because this may in some way iron out valuable differences. The address of Professor Boyd H. Bode of Ohio State University on 'Personal Freedom, Democracy, and Social Control,' started reverberations of several homely anecdotes in the Lincoln manner, and got confreres of all nations chuckling over his characterization of the present situation in America as being like that of Jim Brown, reported in the local paper as 'doing nicely in the hospital from being kicked by a mule.'

"In spite of language difficulties, and in spite of significant gaps, those who took part in this conference felt that these efforts toward mutual appreciation and understanding are worth making.

"It is impossible to enumerate all who were present, but among the American delegates who took active part in the conference were Mr. and Mrs. Carleton Washburn, Mr. and Mrs. W. Carson Ryan, Dr. Ruth MacMurray, Fred Redefer, R. C. Havighurst, and Dr. Lucy Wilson."

Normal Child Development Study

The studies on growth and development of normal infants which have been carried on by Dr. Myrtle McGraw, under the direction of Dr. Frederick Tilney, of the Neurological Institute, are now to be expanded and continued for another five years at The Babies Hospital in New York. Under grants from several foundations the continued work will be carried on as a part of the Pediatric Department of the College of Physicians and Surgeons, with Dr. Herbert B. Wilcox as director.

In addition to the children who have been under observation during the past five years, six new infants have been added to the study group; and though these investigations will include the relatively small number of about twelve children, it is planned to carry on these studies in each case completely enough

to record all the progress made physically, functionally, and intellectually. This will include observations and analyses of the development of the central nervous system, the musculature, and the progress of the special senses as recorded through instruments of precision. It is expected ultimately to provide graphic records of the progress of the infant system toward mature capacity and toward coordination of these various functions. Information will be amassed by bio-metric, bio-chemical, and electro-metric measurements, with the expectation of arriving at some definite understanding of the stages and processes through which the growing organism must pass in its approach to maturity.

Conference on Educational Broadcasting

The first national conference on educational broadcasting will be held at the Hotel Mayflower in Washington, D. C., on December 10, 11, and 12, 1936. It is sponsored by eighteen national organizations in cooperation with the United States Office of Education, and the Federal Communications Commission, and will serve as a clearing house for information on the latest technical and professional developments in the educational use of radio.

The program will include such topics as schools of the air, radio music, speech and drama, religious broadcasts, forums on the air, organization of listening groups, radio workshops, broadcasting to schools, use of radio programs by colleges and universities, use of radio by libraries and museums, radio programs for children, problems of research in educational broadcasting, audience attitudes, educational broadcasting in other countries, organizing the community on behalf of a radio station, and others.

All organizations interested in radio as a social force, nationally or regionally, are invited to participate, and government officials and prominent educators from America and foreign countries will take part. Further information can be obtained from the Executive Secretary of the Conference, C. S. Marsh, at 744 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C.

Junior Natural History

The American Museum of Natural History has begun the publication of a new monthly magazine for young people. The Junior Natural History is a companion to the magazine which the Museum has for many years published for adult nature lovers. It maintains the same high standard of authenticity, choosing, however, those subjects most likely to appeal to young interests. In addition to its special articles, monthly features include "A Pet for the Month," "Somewhere in the American Museum," and "News from the Zoos." The magazine is copiously illustrated with photographs.

Summer Play Schools

Several new projects in community cooperation marked the twentieth season of the Summer Play Schools of the Child Study Association. Of special significance was the use of one of the Play Schools as an observation center. Manhattanville Play School, conducted in the building of Public School 43, opened its sessions a week earlier than the other schools in order that teachers and staff of other play schools might visit. About a hundred and fifty visitors attended the first week's session, including both teachers from the Extension Division of the Board of Education and WPA workers assigned to the Play Schools. Their classroom observations were followed by discussions under the leadership of Mrs. Bess B. Lane, of the Association's staff. A play school at the Little Red School House was conducted with the cooperation of Professors Beryl Parker and Alice V. Kelleher of the Department of Education of New York University, as a part of the summer school teacher-training program. Teaching staff and student assistance were provided by the University, while the Child Study Association made possible two additional groups and supervised the lunchroom and rest periods. In the Bronx the Bureau of Child Guidance of the Board of Education cooperated with the Community Play School. Children whose difficulties in adjustment to group work seemed to indicate a need for special help were referred to the clinic whose findings and recommendations were then given to the group teacher.

The Play Schools ran for seven weeks, providing all-day care for about three thousand children from New York City's most crowded districts. Work with the parents of these children which was carried on through individual conferences and group discussions will continue throughout the winter under the leadership of Mrs. Jean Schick Grossman.

Two new centers were added this year, at Henry Street Settlement and the Hebrew Educational Society. Other centers conducting Play Schools were Bronx House, Brooklyn Philanthropic League Neighborhood House, Public School 55, Bronx, Ethical Culture School, Federation Settlement, First Hebrew Day Nursery and Neighborhood House, Goddard Neighborhood Center, Hudson Guild, Lavanburg Homes, Madison House, Manhattanville Play

(*Continued on page 63*)

In the Magazines

What Shall We Do About Parents? By Alice S. Christensen. Progressive Education, May, 1936.

In just two words, cooperation and education, Miss Christensen answers her own question. In reaching this conclusion, the writer describes in detail her own experiences in a suburban town, where less than a decade ago the original red schoolhouses—only painted white—offered their meager facilities to an ever-growing population of commuters from New York City. With this influx of people came new needs, and Miss Christensen describes in detail the difficulties and the problems inherent in making this school more modern, and in helping the parents through education and cooperation to become interpreters of the school for the public.

Education for Marriage. By Ernest Groves. Parents' Magazine, July, 1936.

Author with his wife of "Wholesome Marriage," Dr. Groves speaks with rare knowledge and understanding of young people and their needs. In this very succinct article, Dr. Groves discusses the values of college instruction in preparation for marriage. Such courses have been successfully initiated at the University of North Carolina, and the interest has become so widespread that the University now holds yearly conferences of a week, dealing with the teaching of this subject in colleges and universities. Dr. Groves feels keenly that college students are taking a more mature attitude toward the subject of marriage, that they believe that science should be applied to marriage, and they increasingly demand college courses on marriage which are sufficiently practical to meet their needs.

College Standards and Human Values. By H. Austin Aikins. Mental Hygiene, July, 1936.

The writer discusses in detail the everchanging standards and values by which the college adviser must measure the needs and goals of his students. In order to give wise guidance, one must understand the individual and his fundamental problems, and beyond that also the world which he has to meet.

I Borrowed Three Boys. By Margaret M. Miner. Parents' Magazine, August, 1936.

Girls miss a lot not having brothers, but one resourceful mother solved the problem.

Parent Education, April 1 and May 15, 1936.

This issue is devoted to Marriage and Family Counselling. There are three main articles dealing respectively with the history of this type of counselling as a specialized field, the qualifications and training of counsellors and descriptions of typical Counselling Services. There is also a complete bibliography covering 1924-1936, and several shorter articles. An unusually interesting issue which will appeal to anyone who is interested in people being as happy as they can.

Psychology of Success and Failure. By Kurt Lewin. The Vocational Guidance Magazine, June, 1936.

Success and failure deeply affect the emotional status of a person, his goals as well as his social relations. Both are as basic for the very young child as they are for the adult. Dr. Lewin explains in interesting detail some of the studies that have been made in this field. He draws no definite conclusions, for he emphasizes the fact that individuals react differently to success and failure. Whereas one individual after failure may stop entirely, another will show a "stiff backbone," and continue. The author feels, therefore, that it is essential to examine the reasons behind the individual's behavior, because the advisable measure will depend upon the underlying psychological facts thus brought to light.

When Children Are Afraid. By H. S. Lippman, M.D. The National Parent-Teacher Magazine, July, 1936.

While well aware of some of the more obvious fears to which all children are subject, the author of this article focuses his attention toward some of the more indefinable fears and anxieties experienced by many children. He urges parents not to show their own anxieties in the presence of their children. In these times, this puts a tremendous burden upon parents, yet despite the difficulties inherent in a child's anxieties, the author feels it imperative to help parents build up their confidence and lost morale, to teach them how to live and play. In order to keep the child as free as possible from anxiety, it is not essential that the parents have economic security, but it is imperative to make a good adjustment to the lack of such security.

(*Continued on page 60*)

WOMEN IN MODERN WORLD

(*Continued from page 38*)

finds that they are so often still unwilling to accept criticism or well-meant advice.

* * * * *

Both men and women are lonely. Everywhere in our society there is a sense of strain. Marriages are more casual, friendships more superficial, filial relations more callous; religion consoles fewer and fewer people. More and more each soul seems to be an atom living in a world of other whirling atoms, unintegrated with them. That men blame women for this is the highest compliment that they can pay to them. For it means that they look upon women as the integrating force in society. That they hold women responsible for creating the tone of civilization and giving it its content.

It is a challenge which women ought to accept—not just "organized women," for there are limits to what can be done by organization—but every woman in relation to all her personal associations, and to the society in which she lives. Our misery does not arise from women's emancipation. It comes from the dimming of a sense of purpose in the whole of society. To what end are we working, making homes, rearing children? What picture do we have of the future? If there is no picture, then it is every man for himself and the devil take the hindmost. For that struggle women are better equipped than they used to be for survival, but is survival really important?

The century which ended in the emancipation of women was the century which ended with the conquest of the frontier in this country. It was in order to speed on that conquest that women were drawn out of their homes and into the outside world. Today the frontier phase of our civilization is over. We are all dressed up and don't know where we are going.

We might for a moment look back. The greatest vision which the United States has held out to the world has been the vision of human dignity. The conception of democracy has been of a world where a man was to be judged and rewarded not according to his inherited wealth, background, birth, or social status but according to the qualities he was able to develop in himself. And what human and material qualities a civilization desires to preserve, cherish, and promote largely depends upon the attitude taken by women. Women are freer to choose whom they will love today than they ever were in history, but thereby a greater responsibility is upon them for the choice they make. Yesterday they were afraid of casual love affairs which could bind them for life. Tomorrow they will, I hope, scorn them for the effect that they have upon their own personalities and upon the tone of the society they live in. They will realize perhaps more clearly than ever before that one *is* what one loves.

The immense spending power of women can be used to raise the whole standard of production in this country, to encourage a material civilization of quality goods, and thus advance craftsmanship, artisanship, high standards of labor and pay for it, or it can be used to encourage a whirling turnover of more and more tawdry products. If they want men to resent them less, they should work to raise the wages of school teachers, so that more men will enter the teaching profession, and little boys will not be brought up under the sole authority of women, from infancy to adolescence, so that as grown men they both resent women and are cowed by them.

They can go into wholesale competition with men for the sake of bolstering their own prestige, or they can work for a society where prestige will play a smaller role altogether, where genuine achievement will be considered above financial success, and where people are judged less by what they do than by what they are. They can use their social power to encourage love for money, or they can use it to encourage admiration for creative talent and fine behavior.

And where they stand fifty years from now will depend upon the choices they make in the next decades.

IN THE MAGAZINES

(*Continued from page 59*)

Why Boys Leave Home. By Charles B. Hahn et al. Parent-Teacher Magazine, August, 1936.

The author is a nationally known authority on boys' work, and he says that 50,000 boys have left home because of grouchy fathers since he has been working in the field. Other causes of their leaving are love of adventure, fed by movies and radio, and boys' books, escape from school or unsuitable social environment, divorced parents, and economic insecurity. "They are problem boys because life has given them problems too intricate for them to solve. . . . There are no delinquent children but only delinquent parents." Use "do's," not "don'ts," and remember that no one was ever changed from the wrong way except through kindness.

WOMAN'S SUBJECTIVE DEPENDENCE UPON MAN

(*Continued from page 41*)

who brings only feeling to all problems of life is psychically one-sided and without the balance that comes from developed thought, just as is the person who brings only thought to all problems of life and is lacking in the functions of feeling and intuition with which to meet the many situations where they are needed.

A woman who can adequately assimilate an emotional experience, whether it be a love affair or the birth of a child, and be enriched and broadened by it has learned the art of life and developed her personality far more completely than the man who makes of love "a thing apart." For love should have at least equal place with the ego instincts in our lives; and in their struggle for expression in other fields, men have made the mistake of repressing and belittling love as compared to the drive for power, giving it second place and thereby impoverishing their own natures.

Women Take Warning!

• There is a question today whether women will follow men in their struggle for power. The men of our world have wrested wealth from nature, and from one another, but now they stand helpless like Frankenstein before the monster which they have created—before the twin spectres of Force and Greed which stalk the world. As women become conscious of themselves and aware of ego desires beyond those expressed in sex appeal, the desire for power in the world of men is likely to possess their being in the same way that it has dominated the egotistic male through the ages. The ruthless desire for power is the instinctive expression of the crude ego; while love and altruism serve the ego transformed and raised from its instinctive form to its higher human aspect. The great question is whether women, entering the world's field of action at a higher cultural level than men entered it, can skip the stage of crude, personal egotism.

If all that is to be accomplished by women gaining an equal opportunity in the world of affairs consists merely in a shifting of the same principle of power from the shoulders of one sex to those of the other, I for one would pray for the maintenance of the old conditions as the lesser evil. For at least the hope and the promise which lies in the instinctive woman would not be lost. I do not mean that women should not interest or occupy themselves in world affairs as necessity or inclination directs; but I do mean that if they use this activity in the world as an end in itself, instead of as an aid to becoming more highly integrated and evolved human beings, they are defeating their own ends—and they will achieve individually nothing better than men have achieved.

In the struggle that is going on today many highly intelligent women are making the error of ignoring men, or of belittling them and their own love needs, turning away from marriage, while they identify themselves with men in their psychic reactions and attitudes. This is most unfortunate for themselves. No woman who has failed to gain the experience which comes from living in intimate association with another person, especially one of the opposite sex involving the love relation, or who has missed the great feminine experience of childbirth and rearing, can think to escape this loss by minimizing or ignoring it. She must face it resolutely as a loss, whether of conscious choosing or unconscious fate, and at the same time she must find some substitution which transmutes the loss into relative gain.

Toward Better Understanding Between the Sexes

• Finally, as before mentioned, the modern woman needs to attain an inner sense of personal dignity and of respect for herself as an individual apart from the man and the child. In attaining this end, no one factor is more important than women's relations with one another. Indeed, it is only through an understanding of one another's problems that they can forge ahead. Only a short time ago women met solely on the plane of rivalry and jealousy, but now that they have begun to free themselves outwardly from masculine control and are engaging in cultural and professional pursuits, they are coming into a new relation with one another comparable to that solidarity among men which has had so much to do with man's success in the upward struggle. Deep loyalty to one's own sex—I do not mean by that hostility to the opposite sex—is a *sine qua non* of self-respect. Unless a woman recognizes the inherent value of other women she cannot really respect herself, for she too is a woman.

The crux of the matter is that a woman who has enjoyed intelligent companionship with other women will not be content with only an *eros* relation with man, but will demand also a *logos* relation. The

average man still desires only the *eros* relation with woman. For this very reason it is imperative for women consciously to struggle to develop themselves, that they may create a higher and more completely satisfying relation with men.

Women have a unique opportunity at present of rising to a new order of consciousness not only for their own good but for the good of the race. Today a spiritual pessimism and hopelessness pervade the world, and if women cannot bring forth a new vision, a new ideal, I do not know from whence it will come. For they alone can transmute the maternal instinct into that great principle of love and altruism which must be the basis of a new understanding among men. (Surely Bernard Shaw's dedication of his last great compendium on socialism to "the intelligent woman" was more than a merry jest at men's expense.)

Such a mission requires the greatest consciousness of self and a volitional effort of the highest order. There are thousands of women in our country free from the burden of economic necessity who have the time and opportunity for thought and effort of a serious character. What greater contribution to life can they make than to turn their major purpose and effort toward self-realization and development in its highest sense, to that self-creation which would enable them to form the beginnings among themselves of the new human relationships necessary to redeem the world.

For man is caught in the meshes of his own weaving and is slowly awakening to the realization that what he has produced bids fair hopelessly to entangle him in its far-flung strands. Therefore, whether our civilization is to enter into its highest destiny, the destiny that the poets, philosophers, and men of vision have foreseen, or whether it will perish miserably, destroyed by man's own hand, as men of science are now predicting, will largely depend upon what we, as women, make of ourselves. For in our great task of creating more highly evolved human beings, those possessing true individuality and a deepened consciousness of woman's responsibility, lies a new hope for humanity.

PARENTS' QUESTIONS

(*Continued from page 51*)

Both my husband and I have jobs outside the home equally important and equally demanding. Eight years ago, when we were married, we devised a plan by which each was to take a fifty-fifty responsibility for all household duties. We were also to share and share alike in the care of any children that might be born to us. We now have a boy of five and a girl of three.

For some reason our plan has never been successfully carried out. From time to time we have renewed our efforts in that direction but with many conflicts and little success. Because of many debts we can afford to employ only a young untrained maid and therefore at this point I find myself taking almost complete responsibility for the details involved in running a house and caring for the children as well as trying to do justice to a full-time job. It is more than I can manage. What ought I to do?

I should scrap the old plan and try a new one in the light of your eight years' experience. As you state your case, your husband has a full-time job, and you have almost two. No one can do justice to a full-time job, almost complete responsibility for the details involved in running a house, and the care of two children. On the other hand, due to training, environment, or to innate differences between the sexes, men as a rule find the routine of housework and the care of children physically harassing and psychically exhausting. Our traditions being what they are, men's drive for business advancement and increasing financial security in order to keep their own self-respect and gain the respect of the community probably makes your husband's work much more difficult than yours, even though on the surface yours seems equally demanding.

Would it be worth a try to agree to leave your husband free from the daily household responsibilities in order that he may give his best efforts to his work? Perhaps the assistance that he may give you by spending some of his free time with the children, and so giving you more leisure, may prove more satisfactory in the long run than your attempts fully to carry out your plan.

You and the maid and the children will then have to make a new division of duties and responsibilities. Perhaps your older child may be guided to take more of the responsibility for bathing and dressing himself, and for keeping his room tidy. Perhaps the maid, young as she is, could be helped to assume more responsibility. Your household duties might be scrutinized and sifted so that only essential ones would remain in your routine. Perhaps you will be

able to substitute for your fifty-fifty plan another in which your husband gives his present energies to his job and is as helpful as possible at home, and you give your greatest energies to your home—and still manage to keep yourself in harness for your job.

You may feel that this still leaves you with too much work. Yet there seems to be no way in which the mother of a family, even one who is gainfully employed, can avoid the lion's share of home responsibilities.

STATEMENT OF OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, CIRCULATION, ETC., REQUIRED BY THE ACTS OF CONGRESS OF AUGUST 24, 1912, AND MARCH 3, 1933

of CHILD STUDY, published 8 times yearly—October through May—at New York, N. Y., for October 1, 1936.

State of New York }
County of New York } ss.

Before me, a Notary Public, in and for the State and county aforesaid, personally appeared Sidonie M. Gruenberg, who, having been duly sworn according to law, deposes and says that she is the Director, Editorial Board, of the CHILD STUDY magazine, and that the following is, to the best of her knowledge and belief, a true statement of the ownership, management (and if a daily paper, the circulation), etc., of the aforesaid publication for the date shown in the above caption, required by the Act of August 24, 1912, as amended by the Act of March 3, 1933, embodied in section 537, Postal Laws and Regulations, printed on the reverse of this form, to wit:

1. That the names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor, and business managers are:

Publisher—Select Printing Co., 80 Lafayette Street, New York, N.Y.

Editor—None.

Director, Editorial Board—Sidonie M. Gruenberg, 221 West 57th Street.

Business Manager—Donald Cope, 80 Lafayette Street, New York, N. Y.

2. That the owner is: (If owned by a corporation, its name and address must be stated and also immediately thereunder the names and addresses of stockholders owning or holding one per cent or more of total amount of stock. If not owned by a corporation, the names and addresses of the individual owners must be given. If owned by a firm, company, or other unincorporated concern, its name and address, as well as those of each individual member, must be given.) Child Study Association of America, a philanthropic educational corporation, without stockholders, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y., Mrs. Everett Dean Martin, President.

3. That the known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding 1 per cent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are: (If there are none, so state.)

None.

4. That the two paragraphs next above, giving the names of the owners, stockholders, and security holders, if any, contain not only the list of stockholders and security holders as they appear upon the books of the company but also, in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting, is given; also that the said two paragraphs contain statements embracing affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner; and this affiant has no reason to believe that any other person, association, or corporation has any interest direct or indirect in the said stock, bonds, or other securities than as so stated by him.

5. That the average number of copies of each issue of this publication sold or distributed, through the mails or otherwise, to paid subscribers during the twelve months preceding the date shown above is..... (This information is required from daily publications only.)

SIDONIE M. GRUENBERG,
Director, Editorial Board.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 27th day of October, 1936.
WALTER L. BISHOP, Notary Public, Queens County.

(Seal)

Queens Co. Clk's No. 105, Reg. No. 3070.
N. Y. Co. Clk's No. 1, Reg. No. 7-B-1.
Commission Expires March 30, 1937.

NEWS AND NOTES

(*Continued from page 58*)

School, Recreation Rooms and Settlement, Sunshine Kindergarten, and Temple Israel Community Center. All of these schools were affiliated with the Child Study Association's Summer Play Schools Committee, of which Mrs. Fred M. Stein is chairman, and Mrs. Adele S. Mossler, Director of Play Schools.

Children Under the Social Security Act

The welfare of children is one of the major objectives of the Social Security Act. In the year since its passage, in August, 1935, it has already brought an increased measure of security to hundreds of thousands of children in practically every state in the Union.

Every part of the Act—covering unemployment compensation, old-age security, and other general welfare and public health measures—contributes toward the security of family life and so toward a better start in life for children. In addition to these general safeguards, the Act contains four provisions expressly designed to meet urgent and long recognized needs for certain kinds of child protection. Of these four measures, one, aid to dependent children, is administered by the Bureau of Public Assistance of the Social Security Board, under the direction of Jane M. Hoey. Three provisions, for maternal and child health, crippled children and child-welfare services, are administered by the Children's Bureau of the Department of Labor, of which Katherine F. Lenroot is Chief.

To states with approved plans, the Social Security Board makes grants equal to one-third of the state's total expenditures. Though the state itself determines how large its payments for aid to dependent children shall be, the upper limit on which Federal contributions may be based is $18 monthly for the first dependent child under 16, and $14 for each additional child in the same family. Federal grants for the period from February 1 to September 1 total $4,585,875. The purpose of this provision is not only to keep these children from suffering and want, but also to make it possible for them to grow up in their own homes. Long experience has proved this to be the best method of providing for children who have lost the support of their natural breadwinner—best for society because it is more economical and more effective than other methods; best for the parent because, even where the payment is small, it is something regular to count on and to see the children through; and best for the child because family life

supplies the kind of discipline which is more than mere "obedience," the give-and-take of doing and sharing with others, and the sense of "belonging," all of which are essential foundations for character and self-sufficiency in adult life.

Under these provisions, no payments are made to individuals; their purpose is, rather, to strengthen and expand community child welfare services. The maternal and child-health measures are designed to extend health services for mothers and children, including prenatal care; the provisions for crippled children cover medical care and other services; and the child welfare program is intended to assist in the development of adequate community programs for the protection and care of homeless, dependent, and neglected children, and those in danger of becoming delinquent. Federal cooperation is offered in order to stimulate the development of provision for the children who hitherto, for the most part, have been outside the reach of organized child health and child welfare agencies. The funds are intended to supplement—not to replace—money now being expended by states, local communities, or private agencies.

In this partnership the state occupies the key position. The Federal government does not deal with individuals, and the local agencies, administered or supervised by the state, are the only places where the "plan" and the people meet. The children with whom the workers in any one of these services come in contact frequently have a variety of needs—social, economic, and health. Preventive and corrective medical care, health and food, education and vocational training, behavior and discipline, recreation and play, family budgeting and planning—these are only a few of the problems on which the local worker must be prepared to give practical advice and counsel.

The Children's Bureau, the Social Security Board, the state and local agencies, are thus working together in this task. And they feel that they can do this efficiently only if the public understands and believes that in caring for its children the nation is making the wisest possible investment in the future of the nation.

The Child Study Association gratefully acknowledges a legacy of $2,500 bequeathed through an insurance policy of Isaac Pfeiffer, whose wife was an active member of the Association for many years.

BOOKS TO GROW ON—MACMILLAN—

By the winner of the John Newbery Medal

MADEMOISELLE MISFORTUNE. **By Carol Ryrie Brink**

Illustrated by Kate Seredy. $2.00

A lively, unforgettable story in a French setting. How Alice goes on a journey with Miss Weatherwax and proves herself a real diplomat by bringing good fortune to her family.

By Cornelia Meigs

THE COVERED BRIDGE

How Constance and Peter helped to save "the bridge with a roof on it"—and other exciting adventures in Vermont in 1800. Pictures by Marguerite de Angeli. $2.00

By Berta and Elmer Hader

BILLY BUTTER

The story of a billy goat and his exciting adventures with the Giovanni family and Buzz Saw, a rival goat from another street. Pictures in color and black and white. $2.00

By Henry B. Lent

TUGBOAT

All about those busy little tugboats that are such an important part of the life of every great harbor. Dramatic pictures by Earle Winslow. $1.75

By Walter J. Wilwerding

KEEMA

About the blue monkeys of Africa and Keema's growth from a helpless baby to a full grown leader of his tribe. Beautiful pictures of wild life in two colors. $2.00

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY, 60 Fifth Avenue, New York